

THE PRECISE SHAPE OF THE EIGENVALUE INTENSITY FOR A CLASS OF NON-SELFADJOINT OPERATORS UNDER RANDOM PERTURBATIONS

MARTIN VOGEL

ABSTRACT. We consider a non-selfadjoint h -differential model operator P_h in the semiclassical limit ($h \rightarrow 0$) subject to small random perturbations. Furthermore, we let the coupling constant δ be $e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}} \leq \delta \ll h^\kappa$ for constants $C, \kappa > 0$ suitably large. Let Σ be the closure of the range of the principal symbol. Previous results on the same model by Hager, Bordeaux-Montrieux and Sjöstrand show that if $\delta \gg e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}}$ there is, with a probability close to 1, a Weyl law for the eigenvalues in the interior of the of the pseudospectrum up to a distance $\gg (-h \ln \delta h)^{\frac{2}{3}}$ to the boundary of Σ .

We study the intensity measure of the random point process of eigenvalues and prove an h -asymptotic formula for the average density of eigenvalues. With this we show that there are three distinct regions of different spectral behavior in Σ : The interior of the pseudospectrum is solely governed by a Weyl law, close to its boundary there is a strong spectral accumulation given by a tunneling effect followed by a region where the density decays rapidly.

Résumé. Nous considérons un opérateur différentiel non-autoadjoint P_h dans la limite semiclassique ($h \rightarrow 0$) soumis à de petites perturbations aléatoires. De plus, nous imposons que la constant couplage δ vérifie $e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}} \leq \delta \ll h^\kappa$ pour certaines constantes $C, \kappa > 0$ choisies assez grandes. Soit Σ l'adhérence de l'image du symbole principal de P_h . De précédents résultats par Hager, Bordeaux-Montrieux and Sjöstrand montrent que, pour le même opérateur, si l'on choisit $\delta \gg e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}}$, alors la distribution des valeurs propres est donnée par une loi de Weyl jusqu'à une distance $\gg (-h \ln \delta h)^{\frac{2}{3}}$ du bord de Σ .

Dans cet article, nous donnons une formule h -asymptotique pour la densité moyenne des valeurs propres en étudiant le mesure de comptage aléatoire des valeurs propres. En étudiant cette densité, nous prouvons qu'il y a une loi de Weyl à l'intérieur du δ -pseudospectre, une zone d'accumulation des valeurs propres due à un effet tunnel près du bord du pseudospectre suivi par une zone où la densité décroît rapidement.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Main results	7
3. Quasimodes	18
4. Grushin problem for the unperturbed operator P_h	29
5. Grushin problem for the perturbed operator P_h^δ	43
6. Connections with symplectic volume and tunneling effects	45
7. Preparations for the distribution of eigenvalues of P_h^δ	50

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47A10, 47B80, 47H40, 47A55.

Key words and phrases. Non-selfadjoint operators; semiclassical differential operators; random perturbations.

8.	A formula for the intensity measure of the point process of eigenvalues of P_h^δ	53
9.	Average Density of Eigenvalues	61
10.	Properties of the density	65
	References	74

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the last twenty years there has been a growing interest in the spectral theory of non-self-adjoint operators, as they appear naturally in many areas, for example

- in the solvability theory of linear PDE's given by non-normal operators,
- in mathematical physics, for example when studying scattering poles (quantum resonances),
- in the spectral analysis of Kramers-Fokker-Planck type operators.

A major difficulty when dealing with non-self-adjoint operators is the fact that, as opposed to self-adjoint operators, the norm of the resolvent can be very large even far away from the spectrum of the operator. As a consequence the spectrum can be highly unstable even under very small perturbations, see for example [10, 6] for a very good overview.

Renewed activity in this field has been sparked by works in numerical analysis by L.N. Trefethen and M. Embree, see e.g. [27, 10], which provides a significant tool for studying spectral instability: the so-called ε -pseudospectrum which consists of the regions where the resolvent is large and thus indicates how far the eigenvalues can spread under perturbations. Following [10], it can be defined by

Definition 1.1. Let A be an closed linear operator on a Banach space X and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Then, the ε -pseudospectrum $\sigma_\varepsilon(A)$ of A is defined by

$$(1.1) \quad \sigma_\varepsilon(A) := \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : \|(z - A)^{-1}\| > \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right\} \cup \sigma(A),$$

or equivalently

$$(1.2) \quad \sigma_\varepsilon(A) = \bigcup_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{B}(X) \\ \|B\| < \varepsilon}} \sigma(A + B),$$

or equivalently

$$(1.3) \quad z \in \sigma_\varepsilon \iff z \in \sigma(A) \text{ or } \exists u \in \text{dom}(A), \|u\| = 1 \text{ s.t.: } \|(z - A)u\| < \varepsilon.$$

The last condition also implicitly defines the so-called *quasimodes* or ε -pseudo-eigenvectors.

Highlighted by the works of L.N. Trefethen, M. Embree, E.B. Davies, M. Zworski, J. Sjöstrand, cf. [10, 27, 6, 5, 7, 9, 21, 3], and many others, spectral instability of non-self-adjoint operators has become a popular and important subject.

In view of (1.2) it is natural to study the spectrum of such operators under small random perturbations. One direction of recent research interest has focused on the case of elliptic (pseudo)differential operators subject to random perturbations, see for example [12, 1, 11, 2, 13, 21, 22, 20] and [3, 8, 24].

Following this line, we will consider a class of non-self-adjoint semiclassical differential operators, introduced by M. Hager [12], subject to random perturbations and we will give a complete description of the density of eigenvalues.

1.1. Hager's model. Let $0 < h \ll 1$, we consider the semiclassical operator $P_h : L^2(S^1) \rightarrow L^2(S^1)$ as defined by Hager in [12] given by

$$(1.4) \quad P_h := hD_x + g(x), \quad D_x := \frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, \quad S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$$

where $g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(S^1 : \mathbb{C})$ is such that $\text{Im } g$ has exactly two critical points, one minimum and one maximum, say in a and b , with $a < b < a + 2\pi$ and $\text{Im } g(a) < \text{Im } g(b)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\text{Im } g(a) = 0$. The natural domain of P_h is the semiclassical Sobolev space

$$H^1(S^1) := \left\{ u \in L^2(S^1) : (\|u\|^2 + \|hD_x u\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty \right\},$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the L^2 -norm on S^1 if nothing else is specified. We will use the standard scalar products on $L^2(S^1)$ and $\mathbb{C}^N$ defined by

$$(f|g) := \int_{S^1} f(x) \bar{g}(x) dx, \quad f, g \in L^2(S^1),$$

and

$$(X|Y) := \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \bar{Y}_i, \quad X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^N.$$

We denote the semiclassical principal symbol of P_h by

$$(1.5) \quad p(x, \xi) = \xi + g(x), \quad (x, \xi) \in T^*S^1.$$

The spectrum of P_h is discrete with simple eigenvalues, given by

$$\sigma(P_h) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : z = \langle g \rangle + kh, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

where $\langle g \rangle := (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{S^1} g(y) dy$. Next, consider the equation $z = p(x, \xi)$. It has precisely two solutions $\rho_\pm := (x_\pm, \xi_\pm)$ where $x_\pm$ are given by $\text{Im } g(x_\pm) = \text{Im } z$, $\pm \text{Im } g'(x_\pm) < 0$ and $\xi_\pm = \text{Re } z - \text{Re } g(x_\pm)$. By the natural projection $\Pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ and a slight abuse of notation we identify the points $x_\pm \in S^1$ with points $x_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x_- - 2\pi < x_+ < x_-$. Furthermore, we will identify S^1 with the interval $[x_- - 2\pi, x_-]$. We recall that the Poisson bracket of p and $\bar{p}$ is given by

$$\{p, \bar{p}\} = p'_\xi \cdot \bar{p}'_x - p'_x \cdot \bar{p}'_\xi.$$

1.2. Adding a random perturbation. We are interested in the following random perturbation of P_h :

$$(1.6) \quad P_h^\delta := P_h + \delta Q_\omega := hD_x + g(x) + \delta Q_\omega,$$

where $\delta > 0$ and Q_ω is an integral operator $L^2(S^1) \rightarrow L^2(S^1)$ of the form

$$(1.7) \quad Q_\omega u(x) := \sum_{|j|, |k| \leq \lfloor \frac{C_1}{h} \rfloor} \alpha_{j,k}(u) e^k e^j(x).$$

Here $\lfloor x \rfloor := \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x \geq n\}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $C_1 > 0$ is big enough, $e^k(x) := (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{ikx}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\alpha_{j,k}$ are complex valued independent and identically distributed random variables with complex Gaussian distribution law $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$. The following result was observed by W. Bordeaux-Montrieux [1].

Proposition 1.2. *Let $h > 0$ and let $\|Q_\omega\|_{HS}$ denote the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of Q_ω . If $C > 0$ is large enough, then*

$$\|Q_\omega\|_{HS} \leq \frac{C}{h} \quad \text{with probability} \geq 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{Ch^2}}.$$

Since $\|Q_\omega\|_{HS}^2 = \sum |\alpha_{j,k}(\omega)|^2$, we can also view the above bound as restricting the support of the joint probability distribution of the random vector $\alpha = (\alpha_{j,k})_{j,k}$ to a ball of radius C/h . Hence, to obtain a bounded perturbation we will work from now on in the restricted probability space:

Hypothesis 1.3 (Restriction of random variables). Define $N := (2\lfloor C_1/h \rfloor + 1)^2$ where $C_1 > 0$ is as in (1.7). We assume that for some constant $C > 0$

$$(1.8) \quad \alpha \in B(0, R) \subset \mathbb{C}^N, \quad R = \frac{C}{h}.$$

Furthermore, we assume that the coupling constant $\delta > 0$ satisfies

$$(1.9) \quad \delta \ll h^{5/2},$$

which implies, for $\alpha \in B(0, R)$, that $\delta\|Q_\omega\|_{HS} \leq Ch^{3/2}$. Hence, for $\alpha \in B(0, R)$, the operator Q_ω is compact and the spectrum of P_h^δ is discrete.

Zone of spectral instability Since in the present work we are in the semiclassical setting, we follow [9] and define

$$(1.10) \quad \Sigma := \overline{p(T^*S^1)} \subset \mathbb{C},$$

where p as in (1.5).

In the case of (1.4) and (1.5) $p(T^*S^1)$ is already closed due to the ellipticity of P_h . It has been discussed in [9] (in a more general context) that for any $z \in \mathring{\Sigma}$ such that there exists a $\rho(z) \in T^*S^1$ such that

$$(1.11) \quad \{\operatorname{Re} p, \operatorname{Im} p\}(\rho(z)) < 0,$$

there exists an h^∞ -quasimode, i.e. an $u_h \in L^2(S^1)$ such that

$$\|(P_h - z)u_h\| < \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) \|u_h\|.$$

In addition, u_h is localized to ρ , i.e. $\operatorname{WF}_h(u_h) = \{\rho(z)\}$. We recall that for $v = v(h)$, $\|v\|_{L^2(S^1)} = \mathcal{O}(h^{-N})$, for some fixed N , the semiclassical wavefront set of v , $\operatorname{WF}_h(v)$, is defined by

$$\mathbb{C} \left\{ (x, \xi) \in T^*S^1 : \exists a \in \mathcal{S}(T^*S^1), a(x, \xi) = 1, \|a^w v\|_{L^2(S^1)} = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) \right\}$$

where a^w denotes the Weyl quantization of a . In the case of (1.5) we see that (1.11) holds for any $z \in \Omega \Subset \mathring{\Sigma}$. We will give more details on the construction of quasimodes for P_h in Section 3.

For z is close to the boundary of Σ the situation is different as we have a good resolvent estimate on $\partial\Sigma$. Since $\{p, \{p, \bar{p}\}\}(\rho) \neq 0$ for all $z_0 \in \partial\Sigma$ and all $\rho \in p^{-1}(z_0)$, Theorem 1.1 in [23] implies that there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that for every constant $C_1 > 0$ there is a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that for $|z - z_0| < C_1(h \ln \frac{1}{h})^{2/3}$, $h < \frac{1}{C_2}$, the resolvent $(P_h - z)^{-1}$ is well defined and satisfies

$$(1.12) \quad \|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| < C_0 h^{-\frac{2}{3}} \exp \left(\frac{C_0}{h} |z - z_0|^{\frac{3}{2}} \right).$$

This implies for α as in (1.9) and $\delta = \mathcal{O}(h^M)$, $M = M(C_1, C) > 0$ large enough, that

$$(1.13) \quad \sigma(P_h + \delta Q_\omega) \cap D \left(z_0, C_1 \left(h \ln \frac{1}{h} \right)^{2/3} \right) = \emptyset.$$

Thus, there exists a tube of radius $C_1 \left(h \ln \frac{1}{h} \right)^{2/3}$ around $\partial\Sigma$ void of the spectrum of the perturbed operator P_h^δ . Therefore, since we are interested in the eigenvalue distribution of P_h^δ , we assume from now on implicitly that

Hypothesis 1.4 (Restriction of Σ). Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{C}$ be as in (1.10). Then, we let

$$(1.14) \quad \begin{aligned} &\Omega \Subset \Sigma \text{ be open, relatively compact with } \text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > C \left(h \ln h^{-1} \right)^{2/3} \\ &\text{for some constant } C > 0. \end{aligned}$$

1.3. Previous results and purpose of this work. The operator P_h and small perturbations of it (deterministic and random) have first been studied by Hager [12] followed by works by B.-M. [1] and Sjöstrand [21]. In [12] Hager obtained that the eigenvalue distribution of random perturbations of P_h in the interior of Σ is given by a Weyl law with a probability close to one.

In [1] Bordeaux-Montrieux extended Hager's result to strips at a distance $\gg (-h \ln \delta h)^{2/3}$ to the boundary of Σ . In both cases, the results concern only the interior of the pseudospectrum, thus missing an accumulation of eigenvalues effect close to the boundary of the spectrum where the Weyl law breaks down. This effect can be seen clearly in numerical simulations for the model P_h , see Figure 1 and 2. It has furthermore been noted in numerical simulations for other models, e.g. in the case of Toeplitz quantization considered in [3].




Figure 1. On the left hand side we present the spectrum of the discretization of $hD + \exp(-ix)$ (approximated by a 3999×3999 -matrix) perturbed with a random Gaussian matrix δR with $h = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$ and $\delta = 2 \cdot 10^{-12}$. The black box indicates the region where we count the number of eigenvalues to obtain the image on the right hand side. There we show the integrated experimental density of eigenvalues, averaged over 400 realizations of random Gaussian matrices, and the integrated Weyl law. We can see clearly a region close to the boundary of the pseudospectrum where Weyl asymptotics of the eigenvalues breaks down.




Figure 2. As in Figure 1 (using a 1999×1999 -matrix for the approximation) with $h = 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$ and $\delta = \exp(-1/h)$. Here, the Weyl law breaks down even more dramatically than in Figure 1.

To the best of the author's knowledge, there has never been, until now, a precise description of this phenomenon. This leads to the main question treated in this paper: We want to study the distribution of eigenvalues of a random perturbation of the operator P_h in the whole of Σ . In particular this means studying regions where the norm of the resolvent of the unperturbed operator P_h is much larger, of the same order of magnitude and much smaller than the coupling constant δ .

Outline. The principal aim of this work is to give a detailed description of the average density of eigenvalues of the randomly perturbed operator P_h^δ .

Section 2 we shall present our main results: we shall state an h -asymptotic formula for the average density of eigenvalues and describe its properties. We will show that the spectrum of P_h^δ is distributed, in average, in a band $\subset \Sigma$ whose breadth depends on the strength of the coupling constant.

In the interior of this band we will establish a Weyl law for the eigenvalues and show that they exhibit a strong accumulation property close to the boundary of this band. Outside of this band the average density of eigenvalues decays double exponentially.

Section 3 will give constructions of quasimodes for z in the interior of Σ and close to the boundary $\partial\Sigma$. In Section 4 we treat the needed Grushin problems for the operator P_h . Section 5 is dedicated to a Grushin problem for the perturbed operator P_h^δ and to its link with the symplectic volume of the phase space. Section 7 will state additional results to prove a formula for the first intensity measure of the random point process counting the eigenvalues of P_h^δ which then will be proven in Section 8. Sections 6 to 10 will prove the main results.

Remark 1.5. Throughout this work we shall denote the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}$ by $L(dz)$; denote $d(z) := \text{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma)$; work with the convention that when we write $\mathcal{O}(h)^{-1}$ then we mean implicitly that $0 < \mathcal{O}(h) \leq Ch$; denote by $f(x) \asymp g(x)$ that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $C^{-1}g(x) \leq f(x) \leq Cg(x)$; write $\chi_1(x) \succ \chi_2(x)$, with $\chi_i \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty$, if $\text{supp } \chi_2 \subset \mathbb{L}\text{supp } (1 - \chi_1)$.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank very warmly my thesis advisor Johannes Sjöstrand for reading the first draft of this work and for his kind and enthusiastic

manner in supporting me along the way. I would also like to thank sincerely my thesis advisor Frédéric Klopp for his kind and generous support.

2. MAIN RESULTS

We begin by establishing how to choose the strength of the perturbation. For this purpose we discuss some estimates on the norm of the resolvent of P_h .

2.1. The coupling δ . First, we give a description of the imaginary part of the action between $\rho_+(z)$ and $\rho_-(z)$.

Remark 2.1. Much of the following is valid for $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ with

$$(2.1) \quad \Omega \Subset \Sigma \text{ open, relatively compact with } \text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) \gg h^{2/3},$$

instead of for $z \in \Omega$ as in Hypothesis 1.4.

Definition 2.2. Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$ as in (2.1), let p denote the semiclassical principal symbol of P_h in (1.5) and let $\rho_{\pm}(z) = (x_{\pm}(z), \xi_{\pm})$ be as above. Define

$$S := \min \left(\text{Im} \int_{x_+}^{x_-} (z - g(y)) dy, \text{Im} \int_{x_+}^{x_- - 2\pi} (z - g(y)) dy \right).$$

Proposition 2.3. Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$ as in (2.1) and let $S(z)$ be as in Definition 2.2, then $S(z)$ has the following properties for all $z \in \Omega$:

- $S(z)$ depends only on $\text{Im } z$, is continuous and has the zeros $S(\text{Im } g(a)) = S(\text{Im } g(b)) = 0$;
- $S(z) \geq 0$;
- for $\text{Im } z = \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$ the two integrals defining S are equal; S has its maximum at $\langle \text{Im } g \rangle$ and is strictly monotonously decreasing on the interval $[\langle \text{Im } g \rangle, \text{Im } g(b)]$ and stric. monotonously increasing on $[\text{Im } g(a), \langle \text{Im } g \rangle]$;
- its derivative is piecewise of class C^∞ with the only discontinuity at $\text{Im } z = \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$. Moreover,

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} S(z) &= \int_{\langle \text{Im } g \rangle}^{\text{Im } z} (\partial_{\text{Im } z} S)(t) dt + S(\langle \text{Im } g \rangle), \\ (\partial_{\text{Im } z} S)(t) &:= \begin{cases} x_-(t) - x_+(t), & \text{if } \text{Im } z \leq \langle \text{Im } g \rangle, \\ x_-(t) - 2\pi - x_+(t), & \text{if } \text{Im } z > \langle \text{Im } g \rangle. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- S has the following asymptotic behavior for $z \in \Omega$

$$S(z) \asymp d(z)^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

and

$$|\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)| \asymp d(z)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Remark 2.4. Note that in (2.2) we chose to define $\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z) := x_-(z) - x_+(z)$ for $\text{Im } z = \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$. We will keep this definition throughout this text.

With the convention $\|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| = \infty$ for $z \in \sigma(P_h)$ we have the following estimate on the resolvent growth of P_h :

Proposition 2.5. *Let $g(x)$ be as above. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $h > 0$ define,*

$$\Phi(z, h) := \begin{cases} -\frac{2\pi i}{h}(z - \langle g \rangle), & \text{if } \operatorname{Im} z < \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle, \\ \frac{2\pi i}{h}(z - \langle g \rangle), & \text{if } \operatorname{Im} z > \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle, \end{cases}$$

where $\operatorname{Re} \Phi(z, h) \leq 0$. Then, under the assumptions of Definition 2.2 we have for $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ as in (2.1) that

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| &= \frac{\sqrt{\pi} |1 - e^{\Phi(z, h)}|^{-1} e^{\frac{S(z)}{h}}}{\sqrt{h} \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}} (1 + \mathcal{O}(h)) \\ &\asymp \frac{e^{\frac{S(z)}{h}}}{\sqrt{h} d(z)^{1/4}}, \text{ for } |\operatorname{Im} z - \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle| > 1/C, \quad C \gg 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $|1 - e^{\Phi(z, h)}| = 0$ if and only if $z \in \sigma(P_h)$. Moreover,

$$|1 - e^{\Phi(z, h)}| = 1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{2\pi}{h} |\operatorname{Im} z - \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle|}\right).$$

This proposition will be proven in Section 10.1. The growth of the norm of the resolvent away from the line $\operatorname{Im} z = \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle$ is exponential and determined by the function $S(z)$. It will be very useful to write the coupling constant δ as follows:

Definition 2.6. For $h > 0$, define

$$\delta := \delta(h) := \sqrt{h} e^{-\frac{\varepsilon_0(h)}{h}}$$

with $(\kappa - \frac{1}{2}) h \ln(h^{-1}) + Ch \leq \varepsilon_0(h) < S(\langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle)$ for some $\kappa > 0$ and $C > 0$ large and where the last inequality is uniform in $h > 0$. This is equivalent to the bounds

$$\sqrt{h} e^{-\frac{S(\langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle)}{h}} < \delta \ll h^\kappa.$$

Remark 2.7. The upper bound on $\varepsilon_0(h)$ has been chosen in order to produce eigenvalues sufficiently far away from the line $\operatorname{Im} z = \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle$ where we find $\sigma(P_h)$. The lower bound on $\varepsilon_0(h)$ is needed because we want to consider small random perturbations with respect to P_h (cf. (1.9)).

2.2. Auxiliary operator. To describe the elements of the average density of eigenvalues, it will be very useful to introduce the following operators which have already been used in the study of the spectrum of P_h^δ by Sjöstrand [21]. For the readers convenience, we will give a short overview:

Let $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and we define the z -dependent elliptic self-adjoint operators $Q(z), \tilde{Q}(z) : L^2(S^1) \rightarrow L^2(S^1)$ by

$$(2.4) \quad Q(z) := (P_h - z)^*(P_h - z), \quad \tilde{Q}(z) := (P_h - z)(P_h - z)^*$$

with domains $\mathcal{D}(Q(z)), \mathcal{D}(\tilde{Q}(z)) = H^2(S^1)$. Since S^1 is compact and these are elliptic, non-negative, self-adjoint operators their spectra are discrete and contained in the interval $[0, \infty[$. Since

$$Q(z)u = 0 \Rightarrow (P_h - z)u = 0$$

it follows that $\mathcal{N}(Q(z)) = \mathcal{N}(P_h - z)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{Q}(z)) = \mathcal{N}((P_h - z)^*)$. Furthermore, if $\lambda \neq 0$ is an eigenvalue of $Q(z)$ with corresponding eigenvector e_λ we see that $f_\lambda := (P_h - z)e_\lambda$ is an eigenvector of $\tilde{Q}(z)$ with the eigenvalue λ . Similarly, every

non-vanishing eigenvalue of $\tilde{Q}(z)$ is an eigenvalue of $Q(z)$ and moreover, since $P_h - z$, $(P_h - z)^*$ are Fredholm operators of index 0 we see that

$$\dim \mathcal{N}(P_h - z) = \dim \mathcal{N}((P_h - z)^*).$$

Hence the spectra of $Q(z)$ and $\tilde{Q}(z)$ are equal

$$(2.5) \quad \sigma(Q(z)) = \sigma(\tilde{Q}(z)) = \{t_0^2, t_1^2, \dots\}, \quad 0 \leq t_j \nearrow \infty.$$

We will show in Proposition 3.7 that for $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ as in (2.1)

$$(2.6) \quad t_0^2(z) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(d(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} h e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right), \quad t_1^2(z) \geq \frac{d(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} h}{\mathcal{O}(1)}.$$

Now consider the orthonormal basis of $L^2(S^1)$

$$(2.7) \quad \{e_0, e_1, \dots\}$$

consisting of the eigenfunctions of $Q(z)$. By the previous observations we have

$$(P_h - z)(P_h - z)^*(P_h - z)e_j = t_j^2(P_h - z)e_j.$$

Thus defining f_0 to be the normalized eigenvector of $\tilde{Q}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue t_0^2 and the vectors $f_j \in L^2(S^1)$, for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, as the normalization of $(P_h - z)e_j$ such that

$$(2.8) \quad (P_h - z)e_j = \alpha_j f_j, \quad (P_h - z)^* f_j = \beta_j e_j \quad \text{with } \alpha_j \beta_j = t_j^2,$$

yields an orthonormal basis of $L^2(S^1)$

$$(2.9) \quad \{f_0, f_1, \dots\}$$

consisting of the eigenfunctions of $\tilde{Q}(z)$. Since

$$\alpha_j = ((P_h - z)e_j | f_j) = (e_j | (P_h - z)^* f_j) = \bar{\beta}_j$$

we can conclude that $\alpha_j \bar{\alpha}_j = t_j^2$.

It is clear from (2.6), (2.8) that $e_0(z)$ (resp. $f_0(z)$) is and exponentially accurate quasimode for the $P_h - z$ (resp. $(P_h - z)^*$). We show in Section 3 that is localized to $\rho_+(z)$ (resp. $\rho_-(z)$). We will prove in the Sections 4.2 and 4.4 the following two formulas for tunneling effect:

Proposition 2.8. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ as in (2.1) and let e_0 and f_0 be as in (2.7) and in (2.9). Furthermore, let S be as in Definition 2.2 and let p and $\rho_{\pm}$ be as in Section 1. Let $h^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll d(z)$, then for all $z \in \Omega$ with $|\operatorname{Im} z - \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle| > 1/C$, $C \gg 1$,*

$$|(e_0 | f_0)| = \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\sqrt{\pi h}} |\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S| (1 + K(z; h)) e^{-\frac{S}{h}},$$

where $K(z; h)$ depends smoothly on z and satisfies for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} K(z; h) = \mathcal{O}\left(d(z)^{\frac{|\beta|}{2} - \frac{3}{4}} h^{-|\beta| + \frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Proposition 2.9. *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 2.8, let $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(S^1)$ with $\chi \equiv 1$ in a small open neighborhood of $\overline{\{x_-(z) : z \in \Omega\}}$. Then, for $h^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll d(z)$,*

$$|([P_h, \chi]e_0|f_0)| = \sqrt{h} \left(\frac{\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)}{\pi^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} (1 + K(z; h)) e^{-\frac{S}{h}},$$

where $K(z; h)$ depends smoothly on z and satisfies for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta K(z; h) = \mathcal{O}\left(d(z)^{\frac{|\beta|-3}{2}} h^{1-|\beta|}\right).$$

2.3. Average density of eigenvalues. Let P_h^δ be as in (1.6), then we define the point process

$$(2.10) \quad \Xi := \sum_{z \in \sigma(P_h^\delta)} \delta_z,$$

where the zeros are counted according to their multiplicities and δ_z denotes the Dirac-measure in z . Ξ is a well-defined random measure (cf. for example [4]) since, for $h > 0$ small enough, P_h^δ is a random operator with discrete spectrum. To obtain an h -asymptotic formula for the average density of eigenvalues, we are interested in intensity measure of Ξ .

Remark 2.10. Such an approach is more classical in the study of zeros of random polynomials and Gaussian analytic functions; we refer the reader to the works of B. Shiffman and S. Zelditch [18, 19, 17, 16], M. Sodin [26] and the book [14] by J. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres and B. Virág.

The main result giving the average density of eigenvalues of P_h^δ is the following:

Theorem 2.11. *Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$ be as in Hypothesis 1.4. Let $C > 0$ be as in (1.8) and let $C_1 > 0$ as in (1.7) such that $C - C_1 > 0$ is large enough. Let $\delta > 0$ as in Definition 2.6 with $\kappa > 0$ large enough. Define $N := (2\lfloor C_1/h \rfloor + 1)^2$ and let $B(0, R) \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be the ball of radius $R := Ch^{-1}$ centered at zero. Then, there exists a $C_2 > 0$ such that for $h > 0$ small enough and for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$*

$$(2.11) \quad \mathbb{E}[\Xi(\varphi)\mathbb{1}_{B(0,R)}] = \int \varphi(z) D(z, h, \delta) L(dz) + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{C_2}{h^2}}\right),$$

with the density

$$(2.12) \quad D(z, h, \delta) = \frac{1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\delta h^{-\frac{3}{2}} d(z)^{-1/4}\right)}{\pi} \Psi(z; h, \delta) \exp\{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)\},$$

which depends smoothly on z and is independent of φ . Moreover, $\Psi(z; h, \delta) = \Psi_1(z; h) + \Psi_2(z; h, \delta)$ and for $z \in \Omega$ with $d(z) \gg (h \ln h^{-1})^{2/3}$

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi_1(z; h) &= \frac{1}{h} \left\{ \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+(z))} + \frac{i}{\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-(z))} \right\} + \mathcal{O}(d(z)^{-2}), \\ \Psi_2(z; h, \delta) &= \frac{|(e_0|f_0)|^2}{\delta^2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(d(z)^{-3/4} h^{1/2})), \\ \Theta(z; h, \delta) &= \frac{|([P_h, \chi]e_0|f_0) + \mathcal{O}(d(z)^{-1/4} h^{-5/2} \delta^2)|^2}{\delta^2 (1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty))} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\asymp d(z)^{3/2}}{h}}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, in (2.11), $\mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{C_2}{h^2}}\right)$ means $\langle T_h, \varphi \rangle$ where $T_h \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{C})$ such that

$$|\langle T_h, \varphi \rangle| \leq C \|\varphi\|_\infty e^{-\frac{C_2}{h^2}}$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ where C is independent of h, δ, η and φ .

Let us give some comments on this result. The dominant part of the density of eigenvalues D consists of three parts: the first, Ψ_1 , is up to a small error the Lebesgue density of $p_*(d\xi \wedge dx)$, where $d\xi \wedge dx$ is the symplectic form on T^*S^1 and p as in (1.5). We prove in Proposition 6.2 that

$$\frac{1}{h} \left\{ \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+(z))} + \frac{i}{\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-(z))} \right\} L(dz) = \frac{1}{2h} p_*(d\xi \wedge dx).$$

The second part, Ψ_2 , is given by a tunneling effect. Inside the $(h\delta)$ -pseudospectrum its contribution vanishes in the error term of Ψ_1 . However, close to the boundary of the δ -pseudospectrum Ψ_2 becomes of order h^{-2} and thus yields a higher density of eigenvalues. This can be seen by comparing the more explicit formula for Ψ_2 given in Proposition 2.12 with the expression for the norm of the resolvent of P_h given in Proposition 2.5. More details on the form of Ψ_2 in this zone will be given in Proposition 2.16.

The third part, $\exp\{-\Theta\}$, is also given by a tunneling effect and it plays the role of a cut-off function which exhibits double exponential decay outside the δ -pseudospectrum and is close to 1 inside. This will be made more precise in Section 2.4.

We have the following explicit formulas for these functions and their growth properties:

Proposition 2.12. *Under the assumptions of Definition 2.2 and Theorem 2.11, define for $h > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ the functions*

$$\Theta^0(z; h, \delta) := \frac{h \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\pi \delta^2}.$$

Then, for $|\operatorname{Im} z - \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle| > 1/C$, $C \gg 1$,

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi_2(z; h, \delta) &= \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi h \delta^2 \exp\{\frac{2S}{h}\}} |\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S(z)|^2 \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{h^{1/2}}{d(z)^{\frac{3}{4}}}\right) \right) \\ \Theta(z; h, \delta) &= \Theta^0(z; h, \delta) \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{h^{\frac{3}{2}}}{d(z)^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right) \right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d(z)^{\frac{1}{4}} \delta}{h^2} + \frac{\delta^2}{d(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} h^5}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The estimates in (2.14) are stable under application of $d(z)^{-\frac{|\beta|}{2}} h^{|\beta|} \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta$, for $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$.

Proposition 2.13. *Under the assumptions of Definition 2.2 and Theorem 2.11 we have that*

$$\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \asymp d(z), \quad \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+(z))} + \frac{i}{\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-(z))} \asymp \frac{1}{\sqrt{d(z)}}$$

and

$$\Psi_2(z; h, \delta) \asymp \frac{(d(z))^{3/2} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{h \delta^2}, \quad \Theta^0(z; h, \delta) \asymp h \sqrt{d(z)} \left| 1 - e^{\Phi(z, h)} \right| \frac{e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\delta^2}.$$

In the next Subsection we will explain the asymptotic properties of the density appearing in (2.11).

2.4. Properties of the average density of eigenvalues and its integral with respect to $\text{Im } z$. It will be sufficient for our purposes to consider rectangular subsets of Σ : for $c < d$ define

$$(2.15) \quad \Sigma_{c,d} := \left\{ z \in \bar{\Sigma} \mid \min_{x \in S^1} \text{Im } g(x) \leq \text{Im } z \leq \max_{x \in S^1} \text{Im } g(x), \ c < \text{Re } z < d \right\}.$$

Roughly speaking, there exist three regions in Σ :

- (1) $z \in \Sigma_w \subset \Sigma \iff \|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| \gg (h\delta)^{-1}$,
- (2) $z \in \Sigma_r \subset \Sigma \iff \|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| \asymp \delta^{-1}$,
- (3) $z \in \Sigma_v \subset \Sigma \iff \|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| \ll \delta^{-1}$,

which depend on the strength of the coupling constant $\delta > 0$. In Σ_w , the average density is of order h^{-1} and is governed by the symplectic volume and thus yielding a Weyl law. In Σ_r , the average density spikes and is of order h^{-2} and is equal to the symplectic volume plus the function Ψ_2 yielding in total a Poisson-type distribution. In Σ_v , the average density is rapidly decaying and is void of eigenvalues with a high probability, since

$$\Theta \asymp \|(P_h - z)^{-1}\|^{-2} \delta^{-2}$$

which follows from Proposition 2.9 and Proposition 2.5.




Figure 3. The three zones in Σ with a schematic representation of $\gamma_{\pm}^h$. The two boxes indicate zones where the integrated densities are equal up to a small error.

We will prove that there exist two smooth curves, $\Gamma_{\pm}^h$, close to the boundary of the δ -pseudospectrum of P_h^{δ} , along which the average density of eigenvalues obtains its local maxima. Note that this is still inside the $(Ch^{-1}\delta)$ -pseudospectrum of P_h^{δ} (cf Hypothesis 1.3) since pseudospectra are nested (meaning that $\sigma_{\varepsilon_1}(P_h^{\delta}) \subset \sigma_{\varepsilon_2}(P_h^{\delta})$ for $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2$).

Proposition 2.14. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma_{c,d}$ as in Hypothesis 1.4 with $\Sigma_{c,d}$ as in (2.15), let $S(z)$ be as in Definition 2.2 and let $t_0^2(z)$ be as in (2.5). Let $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0(h)$ be as in Definition 2.6 with $\kappa > 0$ large enough. Moreover, let $D(z, h, \delta)$ be the average density of eigenvalues of the operator of P_h^{δ} given in Theorem 2.11. Then,*

(1) for $0 < h \ll 1$, there exist numbers $y_{\pm}(h)$ such that $\varepsilon_0(h) = S(y_{\pm}(h))$ with

$$\frac{1}{C}(h \ln h^{-1})^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll y_{-}(h) < \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle - ch \ln h^{-1}$$

$$< \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle + ch \ln h^{-1} < y_{+}(h) \ll \operatorname{Im} g(b) - \frac{1}{C}(h \ln h^{-1})^{\frac{2}{3}},$$

for $c > 1$. Furthermore,

$$y_{-}(h), (\operatorname{Im} g(b) - y_{+}(h)) \asymp (\varepsilon_0(h))^{2/3};$$

(2) there exists $h_0 > 0$ and a family of smooth curves, indexed by $h \in]h_0, 0[$,

$$\gamma_{\pm}^h :]c, d[\longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \text{ with } \operatorname{Re} \gamma_{\pm}^h(t) = t$$

such that

$$|t_0(\gamma_{\pm}^h(t))| = \delta.$$

Moreover,

$$\|(P_h - \gamma_{\pm}^h(t))^{-1}\| = \delta^{-1},$$

and

$$\operatorname{Im} \gamma_{\pm}^h(t) = y_{\pm}(\varepsilon_0(h)) \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{h}{\varepsilon_0(h)}\right) \right).$$

Furthermore, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d \operatorname{Im} \gamma_{\pm}^h}{dt}(t) = \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left[-\frac{\varepsilon_0(h)}{Ch}\right]\right).$$

(3) there exists $h_0 > 0$ and a family of smooth curves, indexed by $h \in]h_0, 0[$,

$$\Gamma_{\pm}^h :]c, d[\longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \operatorname{Re} \Gamma_{\pm}^h(t) = t,$$

with $\Gamma_{-} \subset \{\operatorname{Im} z < \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle\}$ and $\Gamma_{+} \subset \{\operatorname{Im} z > \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle\}$, along which $\operatorname{Im} z \mapsto D(z, h)$ takes its local maxima on the vertical line $\operatorname{Re} z = \text{const.}$ and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \operatorname{Im} \Gamma_{\pm}^h(t) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{h^4}{\varepsilon_0(h)^4}\right).$$

Moreover, for all $c < t < d$

$$|\Gamma_{\pm}^h(t) - \gamma_{\pm}^h(t)| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{h^5}{\varepsilon_0(h)^{13/3}}\right).$$

With respect to the above described curves we prove the following properties of the average density of eigenvalues:

Proposition 2.15. *Let $d\xi \wedge dx$ be the symplectic form on T^*S^1 and p as in (1.5). Let $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(h)$ be as in Definition 2.6. Then, under the assumptions of Theorem 2.11 there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that*

(1) for $z \in \Sigma_{c,d}$ with

$$\operatorname{Im} \gamma_{-}(\operatorname{Re} z) + \alpha \frac{h}{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}} \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}}{h} \leq \operatorname{Im} z \leq \operatorname{Im} \gamma_{+}(\operatorname{Re} z) - \alpha \frac{h}{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}} \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}}{h}$$

we have that

$$D(z; h, \delta) L(dz) = \frac{1}{2\pi h} p_*(d\xi \wedge dx) + \mathcal{O}(d(z)^{-2}) L(dz),$$

where $D(z; h, \delta)$ is the average density of eigenvalues of the operator P_h^{δ} given in Theorem 2.11.

(2) for

$$\Omega_1(\beta) := \left\{ z \in \Sigma_{c,d} \mid \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-(\operatorname{Re} z) - \frac{h}{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}} \ln \left(\beta \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}}{h} \right) \leq \operatorname{Im} z \leq \operatorname{Im} \gamma_+(\operatorname{Re} z) + \frac{h}{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}} \ln \left(\beta \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}}{h} \right) \right\}.$$

we have that

$$\int_{z \in \Omega_1(\beta)} D(z; h, \delta) L(dz) = \int_{\Sigma_{c,d}} \frac{p_*(d\xi \wedge dx)}{2\pi h} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_0^{-\frac{2}{3}})$$

(3) for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $\Omega(\varepsilon) \subseteq \Sigma_{c,d} \setminus \Omega_2(\beta, \varepsilon)$ satisfying Hypothesis 1.4, where

$$\Omega_2(\beta, \varepsilon) := \left\{ z \in \Sigma_{c,d} \mid \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-(\operatorname{Re} z) - \frac{h}{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}} \ln \left(\beta \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}}{h} \right) - \varepsilon \leq \operatorname{Im} z \leq \operatorname{Im} \gamma_+(\operatorname{Re} z) + \frac{h}{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}} \ln \left(\beta \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}}{h} \right) + \varepsilon \right\},$$

we have that

$$\int_{\Omega(\varepsilon)} D(z; h, \delta) L(dz) = \mathcal{O}(\exp \{ -e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{C h}} \}).$$

Proposition 2.15 makes more precise the rough description of the behavior of the average density of eigenvalues, given at the beginning of this section: Point 1. tells us that in the interior of the δ -pseudospectrum, up to a distance of order $h \ln \frac{1}{h}$ to the curves $\gamma_{\pm}^h$ (see Figure 3), the density is given by a Weyl law. Assertion 2. tells us that the eigenvalues accumulate strongly in the close vicinity of these curves such that when integrating the density in the box $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Sigma_{c,d}$ the number of eigenvalues is given (up to small error) by the integrated Weyl density in all of $\Sigma_{c,d}$ (cf Figure 3). This augmented density can be seen as the accumulated eigenvalues which would have been given by a Weyl law in the region from $\gamma_{\pm}^h$ up to the boundary $\partial\Sigma$ (see also Figures 4 and 5 for an example).

The last point of the proposition tells us that outside of a strip of the form of Ω_1 the density decays double-exponentially.

2.4.1. The density in the zone of spectral accumulation. We give a finer description of the density of eigenvalues close to its local maxima at $\Gamma_{\pm}^h$:

Proposition 2.16. *Assume the hypothesis of Theorem 2.11. Let $S(z)$ be as in Definition 2.2 and let $\Psi_2(z, h, \delta)$ and $\Theta(z; h, \delta)$ be as in Theorem 2.11. Then for $|\operatorname{Im} z - \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle| > 1/C$ with $C \gg 1$ large enough,*

$$\Psi_2 e^{-\Theta} = \left[\frac{|\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S|^2}{h^2} \Theta (1 + \mathcal{O}(d(z)^{-3/4} h^{1/2})) + \mathcal{O}(d(z)^{5/4}) \right] e^{-\Theta}.$$

Let us give some remarks on this result. First, we see that we can approximate the second part of the density of eigenvalues by Poisson distribution scaled by the monotone function $\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S(z)$. Second, since $\Theta \asymp \|(P_h - z)^{-2}\|^{-1} \delta^{-2}$, we see that the effects of the second part of the density vanish in the error term of Ψ_1 as long as

$\|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| \gg \delta^{-1}$. However, for $\|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| \asymp \delta^{-1}$ it is of order $\mathcal{O}(d(z)h^{-2})$ and dominates the Weyl term.

2.5. Example: Numerical simulations for $hD + e^{-ix}$. To illustrate our results we look at the discretization of $P_h = hD + e^{-ix}$ in Fourier space which is approximated by the $(2N+1) \times (2N+1)$ -matrix $H = hD + E$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where D and E are defined by

$$D_{j,k} := \begin{cases} j & \text{if } j = k, \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad E_{j,k} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = j + 1, \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where $j, k \in \{-N, -N+1, \dots, N\}$. Let R be a $(2N+1) \times (2N+1)$ random matrix, where the entries $R_{j,k}$ are independent and identically distributed complex Gaussian random variables, $R_{j,k} \sim \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$. For $h > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ as in Theorem 2.11, we let MATLAB calculate the spectrum $\sigma(H + \delta R)$. Since here $g(x) = e^{-ix}$ (cf. (1.4)), it follows that in this case Σ is given by $\{z \in \mathbb{C}; |\operatorname{Im} z| \leq 1\}$ (cf. (1.10)). We are going to perform our numerical experiments for the following two cases:

Polynomially small (in h) coupling δ . We set the above parameters to be $h = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, $\delta = 2 \cdot 10^{-12} \approx 0.1 \cdot h^4$ and $N = 1999$. Figure 4 shows the spectrum of $H + \delta R$ computed by MATLAB. The black box indicates the region where we count the




Figure 4. On the left hand side we present the spectrum of the discretization of $hD + \exp(-ix)$ (approximated by a 3999×3999 -matrix) perturbed with a random Gaussian matrix δR with $h = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$ and $\delta = 2 \cdot 10^{-12}$. The black box indicates the region where we count the number of eigenvalues to obtain Figure 5. The right hand side is a magnification of the central part of the spectrum depicted on the left hand side.

number of eigenvalues to obtain the density of eigenvalues presented in Figure 5. Outside this box the influence from the boundary effects from our N -dimensional matrix are too strong. Figure 5 compares the experimental (given by counting the number of eigenvalues in the black box restricted to $\operatorname{Im} z \geq 0$ and averaging over 400 realizations of random Gaussian matrices) and the theoretical (cf Theorem 2.11) density and integrated density of eigenvalues.




Figure 5. On the left hand side we compare the experimental and the theoretical (cf. Theorem 2.11) density of eigenvalues. On the right hand side we compare the experimental and the theoretical integrated density of eigenvalues with the integrated Weyl law. Here $h = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$ and $\delta = 2 \cdot 10^{-12}$.




Figure 6. On the left hand side we present the spectrum of the discretization of $hD + \exp(-ix)$ (approximated by a 1999×1999 -matrix) perturbed with a random Gaussian matrix δR with $h = 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$ and $\delta = \exp(-1/h)$. The black box indicates the region where we count the number of eigenvalues to obtain Figure 7. The right hand side is a magnification of the central part of the spectrum depicted on the left hand side.

Exponentially small (in h) coupling δ . We set the above parameters to be $h = 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$, $\delta = \exp(-1/h)$ and $N = 1000$. Figure 6 shows the spectrum of $H + \delta R$ computed by MATLAB. Similar to the above, the black box indicates the region where we count the number of eigenvalues to obtain the density of eigenvalues presented in Figure 7. This figure compares the experimental (given by counting the number of eigenvalues in the black box restricted to $\text{Im } z \geq 0$ and averaging over 400 realizations of random Gaussian matrices) and the theoretical (cf Theorem 2.11) density and integrated density of eigenvalues.

The Figures 4, 5, 6 and 7 confirm the theoretical result presented in Theorem 2.11 since the green lines, representing the plotted average density of eigenvalues given by Theorem 2.11, match perfectly the experimentally obtained density of eigenvalues.




Figure 7. Experimental (each point represents the mean, over 1000 realizations, number of eigenvalues in a small box) vs predicted eigenvalue density (i.e. the principal terms of the average eigenvalue density given in Theorem 2.11) for $h = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$ and $\delta = 2 \cdot 10^{-12}$.

Furthermore, these figures show the three zones described in Section 2.4 (see also Proposition 2.15):

The *first zone*, is in the middle of the spectrum (cf. Figures 4, 6) corresponding to the zone where $\|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| \gg (h\delta)^{-1}$. There we see roughly an aequidistribution of points at distance $\sqrt{h}$. The right hand side of Figures 5 and 7 shows that the number of eigenvalues in this zone is given by a *Weyl law*, as predicted by Proposition 2.15.

When comparing Figure 5 and 7 we can see clearly that the Weyl law breaks down earlier when the coupling constant δ gets smaller. Indeed, when $\delta > 0$ is exponentially small in $h > 0$, the break down happens well in the interior of Σ , precisely as predicted by Proposition 2.15.

Another important property of this zone is that there is an increase in the density of the spectral points as we approach the boundary of Σ , see Figure 5. This is due to the fact that the density given by the Weyl law becomes more and more singular as we approach $\partial\Sigma$ (cf. Proposition 2.13).

We will find the *second zone* by moving closer to the “edge” of the spectrum, see Figure 4 and 6. It can be characterized as the zone where $\|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| \asymp \delta^{-1}$. Figures 5 and 7 show that there is a strong accumulation of the spectrum close to the boundary of the pseudospectrum. Furthermore, we see in the image on the right hand side of Figure 4 and of Figure 6 that the zone of accumulation of eigenvalues is in a small tube around roughly a straight line. This is exactly as predicted by Proposition 2.14 and Proposition 2.16. Finally, let us remark that when looking at the Figures 4 and 6, we note that in this zone the average distance between eigenvalues is much closer than in the first zone.

The *third zone* is between the spectral edge and the boundary of Σ where we find no spectrum at all. It can be characterized as the zone where $\|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| \ll \delta^{-1}$, a *void region* as described in Proposition 2.15 (cf. Figures 5 and 7).

Let us stress again that as δ gets smaller the zone of accumulation moves further into the interior of Σ , thus diminishing the zone determined by the Weyl law and increasing the zone void of eigenvalues. This effect is most drastic in the case of δ being exponentially small in h , see Figure 7.

3. QUASIMODES

The purpose of this section is to construct quasimodes for $P_h - z$ for $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ with

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} &\Omega \Subset \Sigma \text{ is open, relatively compact with } \text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > Ch^{2/3} \\ &\text{for some constant } C > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We will in particular always assume that this assumption on $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$ is satisfied, if nothing else is specified.

We make the distinction between the following two cases:

Quasimodes in the interior of Σ : We consider z being in the *interior* of Σ , i.e. $z \in \Omega_i \Subset \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$ such that there exists a constant $C_{\Omega_i} > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(\Omega_i, \partial\Sigma) > \frac{1}{C_{\Omega_i}}.$$

In this case, following the approach of Hager [12], we can find quasimodes by a WKB construction for the operator $(P_h - z)$;

Quasimodes close to the boundary Σ : We consider z being *close* to the boundary of Σ , i.e. $z \in \Omega \cap (\Omega_\eta^a \cup \Omega_\eta^b)$ where, following the notation used in [1], we define for some constant $C > 0$

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega_\eta^a &:= \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : \frac{\eta}{C} \leq \text{Im } z \leq C\eta \right\}, \\ \Omega_\eta^b &:= \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : \frac{\eta}{C} \leq (\text{Im } g(b) - \text{Im } z) \leq C\eta \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $h^{2/3} \ll \eta \leq \text{const.}$ (recall from Section 1.1 that $\text{Im } g(a) = 0$). The precise value of the above constant $C > 0$ is not important for the obtained asymptotic results. We will only consider the case $z \in \Omega_\eta^a$ since $z \in \Omega_\eta^b$ can be treated the same way. We may follow the approach of Bordeaux-Montrieux [1] and find quasimodes by a WKB construction for the rescaled operator

$$(3.3) \quad \tilde{P}_h - \tilde{z} := \frac{h}{\eta^{3/2}} D_{\tilde{x}} + \frac{g(\sqrt{\eta}\tilde{x})}{\eta} - \frac{z}{\eta} := \tilde{h} D_{\tilde{x}} + \tilde{g}(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{z},$$

with the rescaling

$$S^1 \ni x = \sqrt{\eta}\tilde{x} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h} := \frac{h}{\eta^{3/2}}.$$

Note that in this case demanding $\tilde{h} \ll 1$ implies the condition $h^{2/3} \ll \eta$. The rescaling is motivated by analyzing the Taylor expansion of $\text{Im } g(x)$ around the critical point a yielding that for $\text{Im } z \rightarrow 0$

$$(3.4) \quad |x_\pm(z) - a| \asymp \sqrt{\eta},$$

where $x_{\pm}(z)$ are as in Section 1. This shows that the rescaling shifts the problem of constructing quasimodes for z close to the boundary of Σ to constructing quasimodes for z well in the interior of the range of the semiclassical principal symbol of the new operator $\tilde{P}_h$.

Remark 3.1. Throughout this text we shall work with the convention that when writing an estimate, e.g. $\mathcal{O}(\delta^q \eta^r h^s)$ or $A \asymp \eta^r h^s$, we implicitly set $\eta = 1$ when $\text{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$ but keep η when $z \in \Omega_\eta^a$.

Let us note, that by Taylor expansion we may deduce that $S = S(z)$, as defined in Definition 2.2, satisfies

$$(3.5) \quad S(z) \asymp \eta^{3/2}$$

3.1. Quasimodes for the interior of Σ .

Definition 3.2. Let $z \in \Omega_i \Subset \mathring{\Sigma}$ and let x_-, x_+ be as in the introduction. Let $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\text{supp } \psi \subset]0, 1[$ and $\int \psi(x) dx = 1$. Define $\chi_e \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(]x_- - 2\pi, x_-[)$ and $\chi_f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(]x_+, x_+ + 2\pi[)$ by

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \chi_e(x, z; h) &:= \int_{-\infty}^x h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \psi\left(\frac{y - x_- + 2\pi}{\sqrt{h}}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{x_- - y}{\sqrt{h}}\right) \right\} dy, \\ \chi_f(x, z; h) &:= \int_{-\infty}^x h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \psi\left(\frac{y - x_+}{\sqrt{h}}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{x_+ + 2\pi - y}{\sqrt{h}}\right) \right\} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, define for $x \in]x_- - 2\pi, x_-[$

$$\phi_+(x; z) := \int_{x_+}^x (z - g(y)) dy,$$

and for $x \in]x_+, x_+ + 2\pi[$

$$\phi_-(x; z) := \int_{x_-}^x \overline{(z - g(y))} dy.$$

Consider the $L^2(S^1)$ -normalized quasimodes

$$(3.7) \quad e_{wkb}(x, z; h) := h^{-\frac{1}{4}} a(z; h) \chi_e(x, z; h) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+(x; z)} \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(]x_- - 2\pi, x_-[)$$

and

$$(3.8) \quad f_{wkb}(x, z; h) := h^{-\frac{1}{4}} b(z; h) \chi_f(x, z; h) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_-(x; z)} \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(]x_+, x_+ + 2\pi[)$$

where $a(h; z)$ and $b(h; z)$ are normalization factors obtained by the stationary phase method. Thus, $a(h; z) \sim a_0(z) + ha_1(z) + \dots \neq 0$ and $b(h; z) \sim b_0(z) + hb_1(z) + \dots \neq 0$ depend smoothly on z such that all derivatives with respect to z and $\bar{z}$ are bounded when $h \rightarrow 0$.

The quasimodes e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} are WKB approximate null solutions to $(P_h - z)$ and $(P_h - z)^*$ where $a(z; h)$ and $b(z; h)$ are the asymptotic expansions of the normalization coefficients and it is easy to see that for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$(3.9) \quad \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta a(z, h), \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta b(z, h) = \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\beta|}).$$

Lemma 3.3.

$$(3.10) \quad a_0 = \left(\frac{-\text{Im } g'(x_+)}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \text{ and } b_0 = \left(\frac{\text{Im } g'(x_-)}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Proof. We will show the proof only for a_0^i since the statement for b_0^i can be achieved by analogous steps. We are interested in the integral

$$I_h := h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int \chi_e(x, z; h)^2 e^{\frac{-\Phi(x; z)}{h}} dx,$$

where

$$i\phi_+(x; z) - \overline{i\phi_+(x; z)} = -2\text{Im} \int_{x_+(z)}^x (z - g(y)) dy = -\Phi(x; z).$$

On the support of χ_e the phase $\Phi(x; z)$ has the unique critical point $x = x_+(z)$ which is non-degenerate since $\partial_{xx}^2 \Phi(x_+(z); z) = -2\text{Im} g'(x_+(z)) > 0$. Thus, the stationary phase method yields that

$$I_h = \left(\frac{\pi}{-\text{Im} g'(x_+(z))} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{O}(h). \quad \square$$

By the natural projection $\Pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S^1$ as in Section 1 we can identify

$$\mathcal{C}_0^\infty([x_+, x_+ + 2\pi]) = \{u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(S^1) : x_+ \notin \text{supp } u\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_0^\infty([x_- - 2\pi, x_-]) = \{u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(S^1) : x_- \notin \text{supp } u\},$$

with the slight abuse of notation that on the right hand side $x_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$ and on the left hand side $x_\pm \in S^1$. This identification permits us to define $e_{wkb}(x, z; h), f_{wkb}(x, z; h)$ on $\mathcal{C}^\infty(S^1)$.

3.2. Quasimodes close to the boundary of Σ . Now let $z \in \Omega_\eta^a$. Following [1], we shall construct quasimodes for the operator $P_h - z$ by looking at the rescaled operator $\tilde{P}_h - \tilde{z}$ as defined in (3.3).

Let us first note that $\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(x; z)$ and $\frac{i}{h}\phi_-(x; z)$ have the following behavior under the rescaling described at the beginning of this section:

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{i}{h}\phi_+(x; z) = \frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+}^x (z - g(y)) dy = \frac{i}{\tilde{h}} \int_{\tilde{x}_+}^{\tilde{x}} (\tilde{z} - \tilde{g}(\tilde{y})) d\tilde{y} =: \frac{i}{\tilde{h}} \tilde{\phi}_+(\tilde{x}; \tilde{z})$$

and analogously for $\frac{i}{h}\phi_-(x; z)$. Taylor expansion shows us that the rescaled phase functions $\tilde{\phi}_\pm(\tilde{x}; \tilde{z})$ have for $z \in \Omega_\eta^a$ a non-degenerate critical point $\tilde{x}_\pm(\tilde{z})$ which satisfy the relation

$$(3.12) \quad x_\pm(z) = \sqrt{\eta} \tilde{x}_\pm(\tilde{z}).$$

It is easy to see that locally

$$(\tilde{P}_h - \tilde{z}) e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_+(\tilde{x}; \tilde{z})} = 0,$$

Thus, the natural choice of quasimodes for $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ in the rescaled variables is

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$, $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ and set $\tilde{h} := \frac{h}{\eta^{3/2}}$. Then there exist functions*

$$a^\eta(\tilde{h}; \tilde{z}) \sim a_0^\eta(\tilde{z}) + \tilde{h} a_1^\eta(\tilde{z}) + \cdots \neq 0, \quad b^\eta(\tilde{h}; \tilde{z}) \sim b_0^\eta(\tilde{z}) + \tilde{h} b_1^\eta(\tilde{z}) + \cdots \neq 0,$$

depending smoothly on $\tilde{z}$ such that all $\tilde{z}$ - and $\bar{\tilde{z}}$ -derivatives remain bounded as $h \rightarrow 0$ and $h^{\frac{2}{3}} < \eta \rightarrow 0$, such that

$$e_{wkb}^\eta(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}; \tilde{h}) := \left(\tilde{h}\eta\right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} a^\eta(\tilde{z}; \tilde{h}) \chi_e(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}; \tilde{h}) e^{\frac{i}{\tilde{h}}\tilde{\phi}_+(\tilde{x}; \tilde{z})} \text{ and}$$

$$f_{wkb}^\eta(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}; \tilde{h}) := \left(\tilde{h}\eta\right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} b^\eta(\tilde{z}; \tilde{h}) \chi_f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}; \tilde{h}) e^{\frac{i}{\tilde{h}}\tilde{\phi}_-(\tilde{x}; \tilde{z})},$$

where $\chi_{e,f}$ are as in Definition 3.2, are $L^2(S^1/\sqrt{\eta}, \sqrt{\eta}d\tilde{x})$ -normalized. Furthermore,

$$a_0^\eta(\tilde{z}) = \left(\frac{|\operatorname{Im} g''(a)(\tilde{x}_+(\tilde{z}) - a/\sqrt{\eta})(1 + o(1))|}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad z \in \Omega_\eta^a,$$

$$b_0^\eta(\tilde{z}) = \left(\frac{|\operatorname{Im} g''(a)(\tilde{x}_-(\tilde{z}) - a/\sqrt{\eta})(1 + o(1))|}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad z \in \Omega_\eta^a.$$

Remark 3.5. In Proposition 3.4, we stated the Taylor expansion of the first order terms of $a^\eta(z; h)$ and $b^\eta(z; h)$. However, note that we have

$$a_0(z) = \left(\frac{-\operatorname{Im} g'(x_+(z))}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} = \eta^{\frac{1}{8}} a_0^\eta(\tilde{z}),$$

where a_0 is the first order term of the normalization coefficient a of the quasimode e_{wkb} ; see Lemma 3.3. Similar for b_0^η .

Proof. We shall consider the proof only for the case of e_{wkb}^η since the case of f_{wkb}^η is the same.

By (3.12), (3.6) one computes that

$$\chi_e(\sqrt{\eta}\tilde{x}, z; h/\eta^{1/2}) = \chi_e(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}; \tilde{h})$$

Consider $\|\chi_e(\cdot, z; h/\eta^{1/2}) e^{\frac{i}{\tilde{h}}\tilde{\phi}_+(\cdot; z)}\|_{L^2(S^1)}^2$ and perform the change of variables $x = \sqrt{\eta}\tilde{x}$. Hence,

$$(3.13) \quad \int \chi_e\left(x, z; \frac{h}{\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)^2 e^{-\frac{2}{\tilde{h}}\operatorname{Im} \phi_+(x, z)} dx = \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \int \chi_e\left(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}; \tilde{h}\right)^2 e^{-\frac{2}{\tilde{h}}\operatorname{Im} \int_{\tilde{x}_+}^{\tilde{x}} (\tilde{z} - \tilde{g}(\tilde{y})) d\tilde{y}} d\tilde{x}.$$

The stationary phase method yields that (3.13) $\sim \sqrt{\eta}\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{c}_0(\tilde{z}) + \tilde{h}\tilde{c}_1(\tilde{z}) + \dots)$, where the $\tilde{c}_j(\tilde{z})$ depend smoothly on $\tilde{z}$ such that all $\tilde{z}$ - and $\bar{\tilde{z}}$ -derivatives remain bounded as $h \rightarrow 0$ and $h^{\frac{2}{3}} < \eta \rightarrow 0$.

On the other hand, the stationary phase method applied to $\|\chi_e e^{\frac{i}{\tilde{h}}\tilde{\phi}_+}\|^2$ (compare with Section 3.1) yields that

$$\|\chi_e(\cdot, z; h) e^{\frac{i}{\tilde{h}}\tilde{\phi}_+(\cdot; z)}\|_{L^2(S^1)}^2 \sim h^{\frac{1}{2}}(c_0(z) + hc_1(z) + \dots)$$

with

$$c_0(z) = \left(\frac{\pi}{-\operatorname{Im} g'(x_+(z))} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since $\chi_e(x, z; h) \equiv \chi_e(x, z; h/\eta^{1/2})$ locally around $x_+(z)$, we may conclude that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\tilde{c}_k(\tilde{z}) = \eta^{\frac{3k}{2} + \frac{1}{4}} c_k(z).$$

In particular, the Taylor expansion around the critical point a yields that

$$\tilde{c}_0(\tilde{z}) = \left(\frac{\pi}{|\operatorname{Im} g''(a)(\tilde{x}_+(\tilde{z}) - a/\sqrt{\eta})(1 + o(1))|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad z \in \Omega_\eta^a.$$

Thus, we conclude the statement of the proposition. $\square$

Considering the above describe quasimodes in the original variable $x \in S^1$ leads to the following

Definition 3.6. Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$, $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ and set $\tilde{h} := \frac{h}{\eta^{3/2}}$. Then define

$$\begin{aligned} e_{wkb}^\eta(x, z; h) &:= \left(\frac{h}{\eta^{1/2}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} a^\eta(\tilde{z}; \tilde{h}) \chi_e^\eta(x, z; h/\eta^{1/2}) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(x; z)} \text{ and} \\ f_{wkb}^\eta(x, z; h) &:= \left(\frac{h}{\eta^{1/2}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} b^\eta(\tilde{z}; \tilde{h}) \chi_f^\eta(x, z; h/\eta^{1/2}) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_-(x; z)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi_{e,f}^\eta(x, z; h/\eta^{1/2}) = \chi_{e,f}(x, z; h/\eta^{1/2})$. We choose this notation to make the distinctions between the two cases $z \in \Omega_i$ and $z \in \Omega_\eta^a$ more apparent.

3.3. Approximation of the eigenfunctions of $Q(z)$ and $\tilde{Q}(z)$. Recall Q and $\tilde{Q}$ given in Section 2.2. We will use the above defined quasimodes to prove estimates on the lowest eigenvalue of Q , t_0^2 . Furthermore, we will give estimates on the approximation of the eigenfunctions e_0 and f_0 by the quasimodes e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} . We will prove an extended version of a result in [21, Sec. 7.2 and 7.4].

Proposition 3.7. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ and let $S = S(z)$ be defined as in Definition 2.2. Then, for $h^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll \eta \leq C$*

$$t_0^2(z) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} h e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right).$$

Furthermore, there exists a constant $C > 0$, uniform in z , such that

$$t_1^2 - t_0^2 \geq \frac{\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} h}{C}$$

for $h > 0$ small enough.

Remark 3.8. The case $\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$ has been proven in [21, Sec. 7.1]. Since it will be useful further on we shall give a proof of the statement and indicate how to deduce the statement in the case of $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$.

Proof. Let us first suppose that $z \in \Omega_i$ (cf. Section 3). Recall the definition of the self-adjoint operator $Q(z)$ given in (2.4) and define

$$(3.14) \quad r := r(x, z; h) := Q(z) e_{wkb}(x; z).$$

Recall, by (3.7), that $e_{wkb}(x; z) = h^{-\frac{1}{4}} a(z; h) \chi_e(x, z; h) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(x; z)}$. Since $x_-(z)$ is smooth in z and all its z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivatives are independent of h , it follows from (3.6) that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3 \setminus \{0\}$

$$(3.15) \quad \partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha \chi_e(x, z; h) = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-\frac{|\alpha|}{2}}\right),$$

with support in $X_- :=]x_- - 2\pi, x_- - 2\pi + h^{1/2}[\cup]x_- - h^{1/2}, x_-[$. One computes that

$$(3.16) \quad (P_h - z)^*(P_h - z)e_{wkb}(x; z) = a(z; h) \frac{h^{\frac{3}{4}}}{i} \left\{ \frac{h}{i} \partial_{xx}^2 \chi_e(x, z; h) + \partial_x \chi_e(x, z; h) \left(\partial_x \phi_+ + \overline{g(x) - z} \right) \right\} e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+}.$$

where $\phi_+ = \phi_+(x; z)$. Since for $x \in X_-$

$$(3.17) \quad \partial_x \phi_+(x; z) + \overline{g(x) - z} = z - g(x) + \overline{g(x) - z} = -2i \operatorname{Im}(g(x) - z) = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{\frac{1}{2}}\right),$$

it follows from (3.15), (3.16) that

$$(3.18) \quad r = Q(z)e_{wkb}(x; z) = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{\frac{3}{4}}\right) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+(x; z)},$$

which has its support in X_- . Thus, one computes that

$$(3.19) \quad \|r\|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(h^2 e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right),$$

and, since Q is self-adjoint, it follows that $t_0^2(z) = \mathcal{O}\left(h e^{-\frac{2S(z)}{h}}\right)$.

The proof of the desired statement about $t_1^2(z) - t_0^2(z)$ for $z \in \Omega_i$ can be found in the proof of Proposition 7.2 in [21, Sec. 7.1].

Suppose now that $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$. The desired statement follows by a rescaling argument. Recall (3.3) and, using the quasimodes $e_{wkb}^\eta(x; z)$, note that

$$t_0^2(Q(z)) = t_0^2(\eta^2(\tilde{P}_h - \tilde{z})^*(\tilde{P}_h - \tilde{z})) = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^2 \tilde{h} e^{-\frac{2\tilde{S}(\tilde{z})}{\tilde{h}}}\right),$$

where $\tilde{S}$ is defined in the obvious way via $\tilde{\phi}_+$ and

$$(3.20) \quad \frac{\tilde{S}(\tilde{z})}{\tilde{h}} = \frac{S(z)}{h}.$$

Hence,

$$(3.21) \quad t_0^2(z) = \mathcal{O}\left(h \eta^{1/2} e^{-\frac{2S(z)}{h}}\right).$$

The estimate on $t_1^2(z) - t_0^2(z)$ in the case $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ can be deduced as well by a rescaling argument: note that $t_1^2(Q(z)) = t_1^2(\eta^2(\tilde{P}_h - \tilde{z})^*(\tilde{P}_h - \tilde{z}))$. The statement then follows by performing the same steps of the proof of Proposition 7.2 in [21, Sec. 7.1] in the rescaled space $L^2(S^1/\sqrt{(\eta)}, \sqrt{\eta} d\tilde{x})$ and using the quasimode $e_{wkb}^\eta(x; z)$ together with the estimate given in Proposition 4.3.5 in [1]. $\square$

Proposition 3.9. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$. Then the eigenvalue $t_0^2(z)$ is a smooth function of z and the eigenfunctions $e_0(z)$ and $f_0(z)$ can be chosen to have the same property.*

Proof. Let us suppose first that $z \in \Omega_i$. The operator $Q(z)$ is bounded in $H^2(S^1) \rightarrow L^2(S^1)$ and in norm real-analytic in z since for $z_0 \in \Omega$

$$(3.22) \quad Q(z) = Q(z_0) - (P - z_0)^*(z - z_0) - (P - z_0)(\overline{z - z_0}) + |z - z_0|^2.$$

Let ζ be in the resolvent set $\rho(Q(z))$ of $Q(z)$ and consider the resolvent

$$R(\zeta, Q(z)) := (\zeta - Q(z))^{-1}.$$

By [15, II - §1.3] we know that the resolvent depends locally analytically on the variables ζ and z . More precisely if $\zeta_0 \notin \sigma(Q(z_0))$ for $z_0 \in \Omega$ then $R(\zeta, Q(z))$ is

holomorphic in ζ and real-analytic in z in a small neighborhood of ζ_0 and in a small neighborhood of z_0 .

Remark 3.10. The proof in [15, II - §1.3] is given in the case of finite dimensional spaces. However, it can be extended directly to bounded operators on Banach spaces.

By [15, IV - §3.5] we know that the simple eigenvalue $t_0^2(z)$ depends continuously on $Q(z)$. Thus, by Proposition 3.7 and the continuity of $t_0^2(z)$ there exists, for $h > 0$ small enough, a constant $D > 0$ such that for all z in a neighborhood of a point $z_0 \in \Omega$

$$t_1^2(z) > \frac{h}{D}.$$

Define γ to be the positively oriented circle of radius $h/(2D)$ centered at 0 and consider the spectral projection of $Q(z)$ onto the eigenspace associated with $t_0^2(z)$

$$\Pi_{t_0^2}(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} R(\zeta, Q(z)) d\zeta.$$

Since the resolvent $R(\zeta, Q(z))$ is smooth in z it follows that $\Pi_{t_0^2}(z)$ is smooth in z . Now set $e(x, z)$ to be a smooth quasimode for $P_h - z$ for $z \in \Omega_i$ as in Section 3 which depends smoothly on z . Thus, by setting

$$e_0(x, z, h) = \frac{\Pi_{t_0^2}(z) e_{wkb}(x, z, h)}{\|\Pi_{t_0^2}(z) e_{wkb}(-, z, h)\|},$$

we deduce that also $e_0(x, z)$ depends smoothly on z . The statement for $f_0(z)$ follows by performing the same argument for $\tilde{Q}(z)$ instead of $Q(z)$ and with the quasimode f_{wkb} .

Using that $\Pi_{t_0^2}(z)$ and $Q(z)$ are smooth and that the operator $\Pi_{t_0^2} Q \Pi_{t_0^2}$ has finite rank we see by

$$t_0^2(z) = \text{tr} \left(\Pi_{t_0^2}(z) Q(z) \Pi_{t_0^2}(z) \right)$$

that $t_0^2(z)$ is smooth.

In the case of $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_{\eta}^a$ for $h^{2/3} < \eta < \text{const.}$ we follow the exact same steps as above, mutandi mutandis. We take the estimate $t_1^2(z) > \frac{h\sqrt{\eta}}{D}$ for z in a neighborhood of a fixed $z_0 \in \Omega \cap \Omega_{\eta}^a$ (following from Proposition 3.7) and thus we pick, as above, $\tilde{\gamma}$ to be the positively oriented circle of radius $h\sqrt{\eta}/(2D)$ centered at 0. Hence, for $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_{\eta}^{a,b}$

$$\Pi_{t_0^2}(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} R(\zeta, Q(z)) d\zeta, \quad e_0(x, z, h) = \frac{\Pi_{t_0^2}(z) e_{wkb}^{\eta}(x, z, h)}{\|\Pi_{t_0^2}(z) e_{wkb}^{\eta}(-, z, h)\|}.$$

Following the same arguments as above we conclude the statement of the proposition also in the case of $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_{\eta}^a$. $\square$

Proposition 3.11. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ and let e_0 and f_0 be the eigenfunctions of the operators Q and $\tilde{Q}$ with respect to their smallest eigenvalue (as in Section 4.1). Let $S = S(z)$ be defined as in Definition 2.2. Then*

- for $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$ and for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$(3.23) \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(e_0 - e_{wkb})\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(f_0 - f_{wkb})\| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-|\beta|}e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

Furthermore, the various z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivatives of e_0 , f_0 , e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} have at most temperate growth in $1/h$, more precisely for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$(3.24) \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta e_{wkb}\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta f_{wkb}\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta e_0\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta f_0\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\beta|});$$

- for $h^{2/3} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$, $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ and for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$(3.25) \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(e_0 - e_{wkb}^\eta)\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(f_0 - f_{wkb}^\eta)\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}}h^{-|\beta|}e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

Furthermore, the various z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivatives of e_0 , f_0 , e_{wkb}^η and f_{wkb}^η have at most temperate growth in $\sqrt{\eta}/h$, more precisely

$$(3.26) \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta e_{wkb}^\eta\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta f_{wkb}^\eta\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta e_0\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta f_0\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}}h^{-|\beta|}\right)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$.

Remark 3.12. Let us recall that

- for $z \in \Omega \Subset \mathring{\Sigma}$, in the case where Ω is independent of $h > 0$ and has a positive distance to the boundary of Σ we have $1/C \leq S \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$. Thus, we may formulate the corresponding estimates of Proposition 3.11 uniformly in z ;
- for $h^{2/3} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$ and $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ (3.5) implies estimates uniform in z but η dependent.

This implies the following

Corollary 3.13. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.11,*

- for $z \in \Omega_i$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$(3.27) \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(e_0 - e_{wkb})\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(f_0 - f_{wkb})\| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-|\beta|}e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right);$$

- for $h^{2/3} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$, $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^{a,b}$ and for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$(3.28) \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(e_0 - e_{wkb}^\eta)\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(f_0 - f_{wkb}^\eta)\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}}h^{-|\beta|}e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta^{3/2}}{h}}\right).$$

Remark 3.14. The proof of Proposition 3.11 is unfortunately somewhat long and technical and we have split it into several lemmas. Furthermore, we will only be discussing the results for $e_{wkb}(z)$, $e_{wkb}^\eta(z)$ and $e_0(z)$, since the others can be obtained similarly.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$ such that $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$. For $z \in \Omega$ define $r := r(x, z; h) := Q(z)e_{wkb}(x; z)$ as in (3.14). Then, for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$, $\text{supp } \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta r \subset]x_- - 2\pi, x_- - 2\pi + h^{1/2}[\cup]x_- - h^{1/2}, x_-[$ and*

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta r\| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{1-|\beta|}e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

Proof. Using (3.15), (3.16) we conclude by the Leibniz rule that for $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta r = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{\frac{3}{4}-|\beta|}\right) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(x;z)}$$

which is supported in $]x_- - 2\pi, x_- - 2\pi + h^{1/2}[\cup]x_- - h^{1/2}, x_-[$ and one computes that $\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta r\|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{2-2|\beta|}e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.16. *Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$ such that $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$ and let $z \in \Omega$. Moreover, let $\Pi_{t_0^2} : L^2(S^1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}e_0$ denote the spectral projection of $Q(z)$ onto the eigenspace associated with t_0^2 . Then,*

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta \Pi_{t_0^2}(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H_{sc}^2} = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-\frac{|\beta|}{2}}\right).$$

Proof. By virtue of Proposition 3.7 and the continuity of $t_0^2(z)$ there exists for $h > 0$ small enough a constant $D > 0$ such that for all z in a neighborhood of a point $z_0 \in \Omega$

$$t_1^2(z) > \frac{h}{D}.$$

Let γ be the positively oriented circle of radius $h/(2D)$ centered at 0. Note that γ is locally independent of z . Thus, we gain a path such that $0, t_1^2(z) \notin \gamma$ and which has length $|\gamma| = h\pi/D$. For $\lambda \in \gamma$ we have that

$$(3.29) \quad \|(\lambda - Q(z))^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\text{dist}(\lambda, \sigma(Q(z)))} = \mathcal{O}(|\gamma|^{-1}).$$

By (3.22) and the resolvent identity we see that the derivatives $\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1}$, for $(n, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus \{0\}$, are finite linear combinations of terms of the form

$$(3.30) \quad (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1} \partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\alpha_1}(Q(z)) (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1} \dots \partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\alpha_k}(Q(z)) (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1}$$

with $\alpha_j = (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)$ and $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k = (n, m)$. Thus it is sufficient to estimate the terms of the form $(P_h - z)(Q(z) - \lambda)^{-1}$ and $(P_h - z)^*(Q(z) - \lambda)^{-1}$. Since $Q(z) = (P_h - z)^*(P_h - z)$, it follows that

$$(3.31) \quad \|(P_h - z)u\|^2 - |\gamma| \|u\|^2 \leq |((Q(z) - \lambda)u|u)| \leq \|(Q(z) - \lambda)u\| \|u\|.$$

Since $Q(z) > 0$ is self-adjoint and since $\text{dist}(\lambda, \sigma(Q(z))) \asymp |\gamma|$ we have the a priori estimate

$$\|(Q(z) - \lambda)u\| \geq C|\gamma| \|u\|$$

for all $u \in H_{sc}^2(S^1)$, where $C > 0$ is a constant locally uniform in z . This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|(P_h - z)u\|^2 &\leq (\|(Q(z) - \lambda)u\| + |\gamma| \|u\|) \|u\| \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \|(Q(z) - \lambda)u\| \|u\| \leq \frac{C}{|\gamma|} \|(Q(z) - \lambda)u\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant uniform in z . Hence

$$\|(P_h - z)(Q(z) - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = \mathcal{O}\left(|\gamma|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Finally, note that since $[P_h^*, P_h] = \mathcal{O}_{H_{sc}^2 \rightarrow L^2}(h)$ we can replace P_h by it's adjoint in (3.31) and gain the estimate

$$\|(P_h - z)^*(Q(z) - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = \mathcal{O}\left(|\gamma|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Using (3.30) and the fact that $|\gamma| = h\pi/D$ we have that for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus \{0\}$

$$(3.32) \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H_{sc}^2} = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-\frac{|\beta|+2}{2}}\right).$$

Since for $u \in L^2(S^1)$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1} u d\lambda = \Pi_{t_0^2} u,$$

(3.32) implies

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} \Pi_{t_0^2}(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H_{sc}^2} = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-\frac{|\beta|}{2}}\right).$$

□

Lemma 3.17. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.16 we have*

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} e_{wkb}(\cdot; z)\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} \Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb}(\cdot; z)\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\beta|}).$$

Proof. Using (3.7) and the triangular inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_z e_{wkb}(\cdot; z)\| &\leq h^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|\partial_z \chi_e(\cdot; z) a^i(z; h) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)}\| \\ &\quad + h^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|\chi_e(\cdot; z) \partial_z a^i(z; h) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)}\| \\ &\quad + h^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|\chi_e(\cdot; z) a^i(z; h) i h^{-1} \partial_z \phi_+(\cdot; z) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling from (3.15) that $\partial_z \chi_e(x, z; h) = \mathcal{O}(h^{-1/2})$ is supported in $]x_- - 2\pi, x_- - 2\pi + h^{1/2}[\cup]x_- - h^{1/2}, x_-[$, one computes

$$h^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|\partial_z \chi_e(\cdot; z) a^i(z; h) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)}\| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

Using (3.9), the stationary phase method implies

$$h^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|\chi_e(\cdot; z) \partial_z a^i(z; h) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)}\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-1}).$$

Furthermore, since

$$(3.33) \quad \partial_z \phi_+(x; z) = \int_{x_+(z)}^x dy - \xi_+(z) \partial_z x_+(z)$$

it follows by the stationary phase method that

$$h^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|\chi_e(\cdot; z) a^i(z; h) \frac{i}{h} \partial_z \phi_+(\cdot; z) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)}\| = \frac{1}{h} |\xi_+(z) \partial_z x_+(z)| + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Hence, by putting all of the above together

$$\|\partial_z e_{wkb}(\cdot; z)\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-1}).$$

Similarly, using (3.9), (3.15), the stationary phase method implies

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} e_{wkb}(\cdot; z)\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\beta|}).$$

Lemma 3.16 then implies by the Leibniz rule that

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} \Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb}\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\beta|}).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.11. Part I - First, suppose that $z \in \Omega_i$. Let r be as in Lemma 3.15 and consider for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$

$$(\lambda - Q(z)) e_{wkb} = \lambda e_{wkb} - r.$$

If $\lambda \notin \sigma(Q(z)) \cup \{0\}$ we have

$$(\lambda - Q(z))^{-1} e_{wkb} = \frac{1}{\lambda} e_{wkb} + \frac{1}{\lambda} (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1} r.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.15, define γ to be the positively oriented circle of radius $h/(2D)$ centered at 0. γ is locally independent of z . Thus, we gain a path such that $0, t_1^2(z) \notin \gamma$ and which has length $|\gamma| = h\pi/D$. Hence

$$(3.34) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1} e_{wkb} d\lambda = e_{wkb} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{1}{\lambda} (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1} r d\lambda.$$

By Lemma 3.15, (3.21) and (3.29)

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{1}{\lambda} (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1} r d\lambda \right\| = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right)$$

By (3.34)

$$(3.35) \quad \|\Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb} - e_{wkb}\| = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

Recall that e_{wkb} is normalized. Pythagoras' theorem then implies

$$(3.36) \quad \|\Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb}\|^2 = \|e_{wkb}\|^2 - \|e_{wkb} - \Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb}\|^2 = 1 - \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right)$$

which yields

$$(3.37) \quad e_0 = \frac{1}{\|\Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb}\|} \Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb} = \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right)\right) \Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb}.$$

Let us now turn to the z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivatives of $e_0 - e_{wkb}$. By (3.37)

$$\left\| \partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} (e_0(z) - e_{wkb}(z)) \right\| = \left\| \partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} \left(\frac{(\Pi_{t_0^2} - 1)e_{wkb} + (1 - \|\Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb}\|)e_{wkb}}{\|\Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb}(z)\|} \right) \right\|.$$

First, note that Lemma 3.24 together with (3.36) implies

$$\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} \|\Pi_{t_0^2} e_{wkb}\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\beta|}).$$

Using this result and (3.36) implies by the Leibniz rule applied to (3.37) that

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} e_0\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\beta|}).$$

Next, applying Lemma 3.15 and (3.32) to (3.34) yields

$$\left\| \partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} (\Pi_{t_0^2} - 1)e_{wkb} \right\| = \left\| \partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{1}{\lambda} (\lambda - Q(z))^{-1} r d\lambda \right\| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

Thus, Lemma 3.24 and (3.36) together with the Leibniz rule then imply

$$\left\| \partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} (e_0(z) - e_{wkb}(z)) \right\| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

Part II - Now, let $z \in \Omega_{\eta}^a$ with $h^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll \eta < \text{const}$. The statements of the proposition follow from a simple rescaling argument. For the rescaling we use the same notation as in the beginning of Section 3. Let $\tilde{e}_0(\tilde{z})$ be the $L^2(S^1/\sqrt{\eta}, d\tilde{x})$ -normalized eigenfunction of the operator $\tilde{Q}(\tilde{z}) = (\tilde{P}_{\tilde{h}} - \tilde{z})^*(\tilde{P}_{\tilde{h}} - \tilde{z})$ and note that $\eta^{\frac{1}{4}} e_{wkb}^{\eta}$ is $L^2(S^1/\sqrt{\eta}, d\tilde{x})$ -normalized. Thus,

$$\left\| \partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} (\tilde{e}_0(\tilde{z}) - e_{wkb}^{\eta}(\cdot, \tilde{z}, \tilde{h})) \right\|_{L^2(S^1/\sqrt{\eta}, d\tilde{x})} = \mathcal{O}\left(\tilde{h}^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{\tilde{S}}{\tilde{h}}}\right),$$

where $\tilde{S}$ is as in (3.20). Since $e_0(z) = \eta^{-1/4} \tilde{e}_0(\tilde{z})$, it follows by rescaling that

$$\left\| \partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} (e_0(z) - e_{wkb}^{\eta}(z)) \right\|_{L^2(S^1, dx)} = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}} h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

The results on $\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta e_{wkb}^\eta\|$ and on $\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta e_0\|$ can be proven by the same rescaling argument. $\square$

4. GRUSHIN PROBLEM FOR THE UNPERTURBED OPERATOR P_h

To start with we give a short refresher on Grushin problems since they have become an essential tool in Microlocal Analysis and it is a key method to the present work. As reviewed in [25], the central idea is to set up an auxiliary problem of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} P(z) & R_- \\ R_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_- \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_2 \oplus \mathcal{H}_+,$$

where $P(z)$ is the operator of interest and $R_\pm$ are suitably chosen. We say that the Grushin problem is well-posed if this matrix of operators is bijective. If $\dim \mathcal{H}_- = \dim \mathcal{H}_+ < \infty$, one usually writes

$$\begin{pmatrix} P(z) & R_- \\ R_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} E(z) & E_+(z) \\ E_-(z) & E_{-+}(z) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The key observation, going back to the Shur complement formula or equivalently the Lyapunov-Schmidt bifurcation method, is that the operator $P(z) : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ is invertible if and only if the finite dimensional matrix $E_{-+}(z)$ is invertible and when $E_{-+}(z)$ is invertible, we have

$$P^{-1}(z) = E(z) - E_+(z)E_{-+}^{-1}(z)E_-(z).$$

$E_{-+}(z)$ is sometimes called effective Hamiltonian.

The principal aim of this section is to introduce the three different Grushin Problems needed to study P_h^δ : one valid in all of Σ which is however less explicit (here we will follow the construction given in [21, Sec. 7.2 and 7.4]), and two very explicit Grushin Problems, one valid in the interior of Σ and one valid close to $\partial\Sigma$ (here we will recall the construction given by Hager in [12] respectively Bordeaux-Montrieux in [1]).

4.1. Grushin problem valid in all of Σ . Following the ideas of [21], we will use the eigenfunctions e_0 and f_0 to set up the Grushin problem

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$ be open and relatively compact and let α_0 be as in (2.8). Define for $z \in \Omega$*

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} R_+ &: H^1(S^1) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} : u \longmapsto (u|e_0) \\ R_- &: \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow L^2(S^1) : u_- \longmapsto u_- f_0. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathcal{P}(z) := \begin{pmatrix} P_h - z & R_- \\ R_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} : H^1(S^1) \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow L^2(S^1) \times \mathbb{C}$$

is bijective with the bounded inverse

$$\mathcal{E}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} E(z) & E_+(z) \\ E_-(z) & E_{-+}(z) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $E_-(z)v = (v|f_0)$, $E_+(z)v_+ = v_+e_0$ and $E(z) = (P_h - z)^{-1}|_{(f_0)^\perp \rightarrow (e_0)^\perp}$ and $E_{-+}(z)v_+ = -\alpha_0 v_+$. Furthermore, we have the estimates

- for $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|E_-(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}}, \|E_+(z)\|_{\mathbb{C} \rightarrow H^1} = \mathcal{O}(1), \\ & \|E(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} = \mathcal{O}(h^{-1/2}), \\ & |E_{-+}(z)| = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{h}e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right); \end{aligned}$$

- for $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ with $h^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|E_-(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}}, \|E_+(z)\|_{\mathbb{C} \rightarrow H^1} = \mathcal{O}(1), \\ & \|E(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} = \mathcal{O}((h\sqrt{\eta})^{-1/2}), \\ & |E_{-+}(z)| = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{h}\eta^{\frac{1}{4}}e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\asymp\eta^{3/2}}{h}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For a proof of the existence of the bounded inverse as well as the estimate for $\|E(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1}$ in the case of $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$ see [21, Section 7.2].

The other estimate for $\|E(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1}$ can be proven by performing the same steps as in the case of $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$, mutandi mutandis, together with the estimate given by Bordeaux-Montrieux in [1, Proposition 4.3.5]. The estimates for $|E_{-+}(z)|$ follow from Proposition 3.7, whereas the estimates on $\|E_-(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}}$ and $\|E_+(z)\|_{\mathbb{C} \rightarrow H^1}$ come from the fact that e_0 and f_0 are normalized.

Alternatively, one can conclude the result in the case of $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ by a rescaling argument similar to the one in the proof of Proposition 3.11. $\square$

4.2. Tunneling. We prove now the following formula for a tunnel effect from which we conclude Proposition 2.8.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $z \in \Omega \subseteq \Sigma$ and let e_0 and f_0 be as in (2.7) and in (2.9). Furthermore, let $\Phi(z, h)$ be as in Proposition 2.5, let S be as in Definition 2.2 and let p and $\rho_\pm$ be as in Section 1. Let $h^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$ Then, for all $z \in \Omega$ with $|\text{Im } z - \langle \text{Im } g \rangle| > 1/C$, $C \gg 1$,*

$$|(e_0|f_0)| = \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\sqrt{\pi h}} |\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)| \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-\frac{3}{4}} h^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right) e^{-\frac{S}{h}}$$

where for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-3/4} h^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2} - \frac{3}{4}} h^{-|\beta| + \frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

This implies Proposition 2.8. Furthermore, Proposition 4.2 implies by direct calculation the following result:

Proposition 4.3. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.2 we have for $h^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$*

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{\text{Im } z} |(e_0|f_0)|^2| &= \frac{2 \left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi h^2} |\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)|^2 (-\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)) e^{-\frac{2S}{h}} \\ &+ \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{5/4} h^{-\frac{3}{2}} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\partial_{\text{Re } z} |(e_0|f_0)|^2, \partial_{\text{Re } z} \partial_{\text{Im } z} |(e_0|f_0)|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right).$$

Remark 4.4. Let us point out that we can find an even more detailed formula for $|(e_0|f_0)|$ (cf. (4.9)) valid even for $|\operatorname{Im} z - \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle| \geq 1/C$:

$$\begin{aligned} |(e_0|f_0)| &= \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\sqrt{\pi h}} e^{-\frac{S}{h}} |\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S| \left(1 + \frac{2\pi - |\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S|}{|\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S|} e^{\operatorname{Re} \Phi}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{3/4} h^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{S}{h} + \operatorname{Re} \Phi}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 4.2. First, suppose that $z \in \Omega$ with $\operatorname{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$. Then, by Proposition 3.11

$$(4.4) \quad (e_0|f_0) = (e_0|f_{wkb}) + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right) = (e_{wkb}|f_{wkb}) + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

Recall the definition of the quasimodes e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} from Section 3. Moreover, recall from Section 1 that by the natural projection $\Pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S^1$ we identify S^1 with the interval $[x_-(z) - 2\pi, x_-(z)[$. This choice leads to the fact that ϕ_+ is given by

$$\phi_+(x) = \int_{x_+(z)}^x (z - g(y)) dy$$

on this interval, whereas ϕ_- is given by

$$\phi_-(x) = \begin{cases} \int_{x_-(z)}^x \overline{(z - g(y))} dy, & \text{for } x \in [x_+(z), x_-(z)[, \\ \int_{x_-(z)-2\pi}^x \overline{(z - g(y))} dy, & \text{for } x \in [x_-(z) - 2\pi, x_+(z)[. \end{cases}$$

Define

$$(4.5) \quad R := \frac{a\bar{b}}{\sqrt{h}} = \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\sqrt{\pi}} + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}),$$

where we used Lemma 3.3, Proposition 3.4 and (4.22) to gain the equality. A straight forward computation yields that

$$\begin{aligned} (e_{wkb}|f_{wkb}) &= R e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+(z)}^{x_-(z)-2\pi} (z - g(y)) dy} \int_{x_-(z)-2\pi}^{x_+(z)} \chi_e(x) \chi_f(x) dx \\ &\quad + R e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+(z)}^{x_-(z)} (z - g(y)) dy} \int_{x_+(z)}^{x_-(z)} \chi_e(x) \chi_f(x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Using (3.6) and Definition 3.6, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x_-(z)-2\pi}^{x_+(z)} \chi_e(x) \chi_f(x) dx &= x_+(z) - (x_-(z) - 2\pi) \\ &\quad - \int_{x_-(z)-2\pi}^{x_-(z)-2\pi+\sqrt{h}} (1 - \chi_e(x)) dx - \int_{x_+(z)+2\pi-\sqrt{h}}^{x_+(z)+2\pi} (1 - \chi_f(x)) dx \\ &= x_+(z) - (x_-(z) - 2\pi) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

and similarly

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{x_+(z)}^{x_-(z)} \chi_e(x) \chi_f(x) dx = x_-(z) - x_+(z) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}).$$

Now let us assume that we are below the spectral line of P_h , i.e. $\text{Im } z \leq \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$. There, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |(e_{wkb}|f_{wkb})| &= \text{Re}^{-\frac{1}{h}\text{Im} \int_{x_+(z)}^{x_-(z)} (z-g(y))dy} \left| (x_-(z) - x_+(z)) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(x_+(z) - (x_-(z) - 2\pi) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}) \right) e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{h}(z-\langle g \rangle)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, if we are above the spectral line, i.e. $\text{Im } z \geq \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(e_{wkb}|f_{wkb})| &= \text{Re}^{-\frac{1}{h}\text{Im} \int_{x_+(z)}^{x_-(z)-2\pi} (z-g(y))dy} \left| (x_+(z) - (x_+(z) - 2\pi)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}) + \left(x_-(z) - x_+(z) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}) \right) e^{\frac{2\pi i}{h}(z-\langle g \rangle)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (4.4), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |(e_0|f_0)| &= \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\sqrt{\pi h}} e^{-\frac{S}{h}} |\partial_{\text{Im } z} S| \left(1 + \frac{2\pi - |\partial_{\text{Im } z} S|}{|\partial_{\text{Im } z} S|} e^{\text{Re } \Phi} \right) \\ (4.9) \quad &+ \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{3/4} h^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{S}{h} + \text{Re } \Phi}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi = \Phi(z, h)$ is as in Proposition 2.5. Note that $\exp\{\Phi(z, h)\}$ is exponentially small for $|\text{Im } z - \langle \text{Im } g \rangle| > 1/C$. Thus,

$$(4.10) \quad |(e_0|f_0)| = \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\sqrt{\pi h}} e^{-\frac{S}{h}} |\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)| \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-3/4} h^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \right).$$

Now let us discuss the $\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta$ -derivatives of the errors. First let us treat the error term $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h})$ from the definition of R which is given as a product of the normalization coefficients of the quasimodes e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} . Thus, it is easy to see that

$$(4.11) \quad \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}) = \mathcal{O}(h^{-(|\beta|-1/2)}).$$

The $\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta$ -derivatives of the error term in (4.7), (4.8) can be treated as follows: note that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z \int_{x_- - 2\pi}^{x_- - 2\pi + \sqrt{h}} (1 - \chi_e(x; z)) dx &= \\ &= \left(\chi_e(x_- - 2\pi; z) - \chi_e(x_- - 2\pi + \sqrt{h}; z) \right) \partial_z x_- - \int_{x_- - 2\pi}^{x_- - 2\pi + \sqrt{h}} \partial_z \chi_e(x; z) dx. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.15)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x_- - 2\pi}^{x_- - 2\pi + \sqrt{h}} \partial_z \chi_e(x; z) dx &= - \int_{x_- - 2\pi}^{x_- - 2\pi + \sqrt{h}} \psi \left(\frac{x - x_- + 2\pi}{\sqrt{h}} \right) \partial_z x_-(z) dx \\ &= -\partial_z x_-(z). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\chi_e(x_- - 2\pi; z) = 0$ and $\chi_e(x_- - 2\pi + \sqrt{h}; z) = 1$,

$$\partial_z \int_{x_- - 2\pi}^{x_- - 2\pi + \sqrt{h}} (1 - \chi_e(x; z)) dx = 0.$$

(4.8) as well as the respective $\bar{z}$ -derivatives can be treated analogously, and we conclude that $\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}) = 0$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus \{0\}$. Hence, we have

$$\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-3/4} h^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2} - \frac{3}{4}} h^{-|\beta| + \frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Finally, in the case where $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ we can conclude the statement by a rescaling argument similar as in the proof of Proposition 3.11. $\square$

Remark 4.5. It is a direct consequence of (4.6), (4.4) and Proposition 3.11 that

$$\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta (e_0|f_0) = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|+3/2}{2}} h^{-(|\beta|+1/2)} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right),$$

where we conclude the case where $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ by a rescaling argument similar as in the proof of Proposition 3.11.

Proof of Proposition 4.3. The first statement follows directly from Proposition 4.2. The statements regarding the derivatives can be derived by a direct calculation from Proposition 4.2 together with the fact that the z - respectively the $\bar{z}$ -derivative of the error term increases its growth at most by a term of order $\eta^{1/2} h^{-1}$. Moreover, we use that e^Φ is exponentially small in h due to $|\operatorname{Im} z - \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle| > 1/C$. Furthermore, we use that the prefactor $\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}$ is the first order term of R (cf. (4.5)). Recall that R is defined via the normalization coefficients of the quasimodes e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} . It is thus independent of $\operatorname{Re} z$ and its $\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z}$ derivative is of order $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4})$ which can be seen by the stationary phase method and a rescaling argument similar to the one in the proof of Proposition 3.11. $\square$

Now let us give estimates on the derivatives of the effective Hamiltonian $E_{-+}(z)$.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ and let $E_{-+}(z)$ be as in Proposition 4.1. Then there exists a $C > 0$ such that for $h > 0$ small enough and all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$*

$$|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta E_{-+}(z)| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|+1/2}{2}} h^{-|\beta|+1/2} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right).$$

Proof. Take the $\partial_{\bar{z}}$ derivative and the ∂_z derivative of the first equation in (2.8) to gain

$$(P_h - z)\partial_{\bar{z}} e_0 = (\partial_{\bar{z}} \alpha_0) f_0 + \alpha_0 \partial_{\bar{z}} f_0, \quad (P_h - z)\partial_z e_0 - e_0 = (\partial_z \alpha_0) f_0 + \alpha_0 \partial_z f_0.$$

Now consider the scalar product of these equations with f_0 and recall from Proposition 4.1 that $E_{-+}(z) = -\alpha_0(z)$ to conclude

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{\bar{z}} E_{-+}(z) &= E_{-+}(z) \{(\partial_{\bar{z}} e_0|e_0) - (\partial_{\bar{z}} f_0|f_0)\} \text{ and} \\ \partial_z E_{-+}(z) &= E_{-+}(z) \{(\partial_z e_0|e_0) - (\partial_z f_0|f_0)\} + (e_0|f_0). \end{aligned}$$

The statement of the Proposition then follows by repeated differentiation of (4.12) and induction using Remark 4.5, the estimate $|E_{-+}(z)| = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{\frac{1}{4}} h^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{S}{h}})$ given in (4.2) and (4.3) and the estimates given in Proposition 3.11. $\square$

Finally, Proposition 4.2 permits us to prove the following extension of Proposition 3.11:

Proposition 4.7. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ and let e_0 and f_0 be the eigenfunctions of the operators Q and $\tilde{Q}$ with respect to their smallest eigenvalue (as in Section 4.1). Let $S = S(z)$ be defined as in Definition 2.2. Then*

- for $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3$

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha(e_0 - e_{wkb})\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha(f_0 - f_{wkb})\| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-|\alpha|}e^{-\frac{s}{h}}\right).$$

Here, we set $\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha = \partial_z^{\alpha_1}\partial_{\bar{z}}^{\alpha_2}\partial_x^{\alpha_3}$. Furthermore, the various z -, $\bar{z}$ - and x -derivatives of e_0 , f_0 , e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} have at most temperate growth in $1/h$, more precisely

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha e_{wkb}\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha f_{wkb}\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha e_0\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha f_0\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\alpha|})$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3$;

- for $h^{2/3} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$, $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3$

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha(e_0 - e_{wkb}^\eta)\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha(f_0 - f_{wkb}^\eta)\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}+\alpha_3}h^{-|\alpha|}e^{-\frac{s}{h}}\right).$$

Furthermore, the various z -, $\bar{z}$ - and x -derivatives of e_0 , f_0 , e_{wkb}^η and f_{wkb}^η have at most temperate growth in $\sqrt{\eta}/h$, more precisely

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha e_{wkb}^\eta\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha f_{wkb}^\eta\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha e_0\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}x}^\alpha f_0\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}+\alpha_3}h^{-|\alpha|}\right)$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3$.

Proof. Will show the proof in the case of $e_0(z)$ since the case of $f_0(z)$ is similar. Suppose first that $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$. Recall from (2.8) that

$$(4.13) \quad (P_h - z)e_0 = \alpha_0 f_0 \quad \text{and} \quad (P_h - z)^* f_0 = \bar{\alpha}_0 e_0$$

First consider the $\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m$ derivatives of (4.13):

$$(4.14) \quad (P_h - z)\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m e_0(z) = n\partial_z^{n-1} \partial_{\bar{z}}^m e_0(z) + \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_1+\beta_1|=n \\ |\alpha_2+\beta_2|=m}} \binom{\eta+\beta}{\beta} (\partial^\eta \alpha_0(z)) (\partial^\beta f_0(z))$$

and

$$(P_h - z)^* \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m f_0(z) = m\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^{m-1} f_0(z) + \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_1+\beta_1|=n \\ |\alpha_2+\beta_2|=m}} \binom{\eta+\beta}{\beta} (\partial^\eta \bar{\alpha}_0(z)) (\partial^\beta e_0(z))$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} h\|D_x \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m e_0(z)\| &\leq n\|\partial_z^{n-1} \partial_{\bar{z}}^m e_0(z)\| + \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_1+\beta_1|=n \\ |\alpha_2+\beta_2|=m}} \binom{\eta+\beta}{\beta} \|\partial^\eta \alpha_0(z)\| \|\partial^\beta f_0(z)\| \\ &\quad + \|g - z\|_{L^\infty(S^1)} \cdot \|\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m e_0(z)\| \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h\|D_x \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m f_0(z)\| &\leq m\|\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^{m-1} f_0(z)\| + \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_1+\beta_1|=n \\ |\alpha_2+\beta_2|=m}} \binom{\eta+\beta}{\beta} \|\partial^\eta \bar{\alpha}_0(z)\| \|\partial^\beta e_0(z)\| \\ &\quad + \|g - z\|_{L^\infty(S^1)} \cdot \|\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m f_0(z)\|. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.6, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(4.15) \quad |\partial_z^k \partial_{\bar{z}}^j \alpha_0(z)| = |\partial_z^k \partial_{\bar{z}}^j E_{-+}(z)| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-(k+j)}e^{-\frac{s}{h}}\right).$$

By (3.24) we conclude

$$\|D_x \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m e_0(z)\|, \|D_x \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m f_0(z)\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-(n+m+1)}).$$

Repeated differentiation of (4.14) and induction then yield that for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|D_x^l \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m e_0(z)\|, \|D_x^l \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m f_0(z)\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-(l+n+m)}).$$

The estimate

$$\|D_x^l \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m e_{wkb}\|, \|D_x^l \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m f_{wkb}\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-(l+n+m)})$$

follows directly by the stationary phase method together with (3.9), (3.15). Finally, using (2.8), (3.7), consider

$$(P_h - z)(e_0 - e_{wkb}) = \alpha_0 f_0 - h^{-\frac{1}{4}} a(z) \frac{h}{i} \partial_x \chi e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+(x)}$$

which implies for $k \geq 1$ that $(hD_x)^k \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m (e_0 - e_{wkb})$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} (hD_x)^{(k-1)} \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m (\alpha_0 f_0) - (hD_x)^{(k-1)} \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m \left(h^{-\frac{1}{4}} a(z) \frac{h}{i} \partial_x \chi e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+(x)} \right) \\ + (hD_x)^{(k-1)} \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m (g(x) - z)(e_0 - e_{wkb}). \end{aligned}$$

By induction over k together with Proposition 3.11 and (4.15), (3.15), we conclude the first point of the Proposition. The results in the case where $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ follow by a rescaling argument similar as in the proof of Proposition 3.11. $\square$

4.3. Alternative Grushin problems for the unperturbed operator P_h . In [12] Hager set up a different Grushin problem for P_h and $z \in \Omega_i$ which results in a more explicit effective Hamiltonian $E_{-+}^H(z)$. To avert confusion, we will mark the elements of Hager's Grushin problem with an additional " H ".

Bordeaux-Montrieux in [1] then extended Hager's Grushin problem to $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$. It is very useful for the further discussion to have an explicit effective Hamiltonian. Thus we will briefly introduce Hager's Grushin problem $\mathcal{P}^H$ and show that $E_{-+}(z)$ and $E_{-+}^H(z)$ differ only by an exponentially small error.

Proposition 4.8 ([12, 1]). *For $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$, let $x_\pm(z) \in \mathbb{R}$ be as in Section 1.*

- *for $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$: let $I_\pm$ be open intervals, independent of z such that*

$$x_\pm(z) \in I_\pm, \quad x_\mp(z) \notin \overline{I_\pm} \quad \text{for all } z \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

Let $\phi_\pm(x; z)$ be as in Definition 3.2. Then, there exist smooth functions $c_\pm(z; h) > 0$ such that

$$c_\pm(z; h) \sim h^{-\frac{1}{4}} (c_\pm^0(z) + hc_\pm^1(z) + \dots)$$

and, for $e_+(z; h) := c_+(z; h) \exp(\frac{i\phi_+(x; z)}{h}) \in H^1(I_+)$ and $e_-(z; h) := c_-(z; h) \exp(\frac{i\phi_-(x; z)}{h}) \in H^1(I_-)$,

$$\|e_+\|_{L^2(I_+)} = 1 = \|e_-\|_{L^2(I_-)}.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$c_+^0(z) = \left(\frac{-\text{Im } g'(x_+(z))}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad \text{and } c_-^0(z) = \left(\frac{\text{Im } g'(x_-(z))}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

- for $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ with $h^{2/3} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$: let $J_\pm$ be open intervals, such that

$$x_\pm(\Omega_\eta^a) \in J_\pm, \quad \text{dist}(J_+, J_-) > \frac{1}{C}\eta^{1/2}.$$

Define $\tilde{I}_\pm := S^1 \setminus \overline{J_\mp}$. Let $\phi_\pm(x; z)$ be as in Definition 3.2 and set $\tilde{h} := h/\eta^{3/2}$.

Then, there exist smooth functions $c_\pm(z; \tilde{h}) > 0$ such that

$$c_\pm^\eta(z; \tilde{h}) \sim \tilde{h}^{-\frac{1}{4}}\eta^{-1/4} \left(c_\pm^{0,\eta}(z) + \tilde{h}c_\pm^{1,\eta}(z) + \dots \right)$$

and, for $e_+^\eta(z; h) := c_+^\eta(z; \tilde{h}) \exp(\frac{i\phi_+(x; z)}{h}) \in H^1(\tilde{I}_+)$ and $e_-^\eta(z; h) := c_-^\eta(z; \tilde{h}) \exp(\frac{i\phi_-(x; z)}{h}) \in H^1(\tilde{I}_+)$,

$$\|e_+^\eta\|_{L^2(\tilde{I}_+)} = 1 = \|e_-^\eta\|_{L^2(\tilde{I}_-)}.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$c_+^{0,\eta}(z) = \left(\frac{|\text{Im } g''(a)(\tilde{x}_+(\tilde{z}) - a/\sqrt{\eta})(1 + o(1))|}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad z \in \Omega_\eta^a,$$

$$c_-^{0,\eta}(z) = \left(\frac{|\text{Im } g''(a)(\tilde{x}_-(\tilde{z}) - a/\sqrt{\eta})(1 + o(1))|}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad z \in \Omega_\eta^a.$$

Proof. For a proof of the first statement see [12]. The second statement has been proven in [1] with the exception of the representation of $c_\pm^{0,\eta}(z)$ which can be achieved by an analogous argument to the one used in the proof of Proposition 3.4. $\square$

Note that $(P_h - z)e_+^\bullet(x; z) = 0$ on I_+ and that $(P_h - z)^*e_-^\bullet(x; z) = 0$ on I_- . With these quasimodes Hager and then Bordeaux-Montrieux set up a Grushin problem $\mathcal{P}^H$ and proved the existence of an inverse $\mathcal{E}^H$.

Proposition 4.9 ([12]). *For $z \in \Omega_i \in \mathring{\Sigma}$ and $x_\pm(z)$ as in Section 1. Let $g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(S^1 : \mathbb{C})$ be as in (1.4) and let $a < b < a + 2\pi$ where a denotes the minimum and b the maximum of $\text{Im } g$. Let $J_+ \subset (b, a + 2\pi)$ and $J_- \subset (a, b)$ such that $\overline{\{x_\pm(z) : z \in \Omega\}} \subset J_\pm$. Let $\chi_\pm \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(I_\pm)$ be such that $\chi_\pm \equiv 1$ on $\overline{J_\pm}$ and $\text{supp}(\chi_+) \cap \text{supp}(\chi_-) = \emptyset$. Define*

$$R_+^H : H^1(S^1) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} : u \longmapsto (u|_{\chi_+ e_+})$$

$$R_-^H : \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow L^2(S^1) : u_- \longmapsto u_- \chi_- e_-.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{P}^H(z) := \begin{pmatrix} P_h - z & R_-^H \\ R_+^H & 0 \end{pmatrix} : H^1(S^1) \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow L^2(S^1) \times \mathbb{C}$$

is bijective with the bounded inverse

$$\mathcal{E}^H(z) = \begin{pmatrix} E^H(z) & E_+^H(z) \\ E_-^H(z) & E_{-+}^H(z) \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \|E^H(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} &= \mathcal{O}(h^{-1/2}), & \|E_-^H(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}} &= \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \|E_+^H(z)\|_{\mathbb{C} \rightarrow H^1} &= \mathcal{O}(1), & |E_{-+}^H(z)| &= \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$(4.17) \quad E_{-+}^H(z) = \left(\left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{h}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{O}\left(h^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) \right) \cdot \left(e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+}^{x_-} (z-g(y)) dy} - e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+}^{x_-+2\pi} (z-g(y)) dy} \right),$$

where the prefactor of the exponentials depends only on $\text{Im } z$ and has bounded derivatives of order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h})$.

Proof. See [12]. □

Proposition 4.10 ([1]). *Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$. For $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^{a,b}$ and $x_\pm(z)$ as in Section 1. Let $g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(S^1)$ be as in (1.4). Let $J_\pm$ and $I_\pm$ be as in the second point of Proposition 4.8. Let $\chi_\pm^\eta \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(I_\pm)$ such that $\chi_\pm^\eta \equiv 1$ on $\overline{J_\pm}$ and $\text{supp}(\chi_+^\eta) \cap \text{supp}(\chi_-^\eta) = \emptyset$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned} R_+^\eta : H^1(S^1) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{C} : u \longmapsto (u|_{\chi_+ e_+^\eta}) \\ R_-^\eta : \mathbb{C} &\longrightarrow L^2(S^1) : u_- \longmapsto u_- \chi_- e_-^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathcal{P}^\eta(z) := \begin{pmatrix} P_h - z & R_-^\eta \\ R_+^\eta & 0 \end{pmatrix} : H^1(S^1) \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow L^2(S^1) \times \mathbb{C}$$

is bijective with the bounded inverse

$$\mathcal{E}^\eta(z) = \begin{pmatrix} E^\eta(z) & E_+^\eta(z) \\ E_-^\eta(z) & E_{-+}^\eta(z) \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|E^\eta(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} &= \mathcal{O}((\sqrt{\eta}h)^{-1/2}), & \|E_-^\eta(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}} &= \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \|E_+^\eta(z)\|_{\mathbb{C} \rightarrow H^1} &= \mathcal{O}(1), & |E_{-+}^\eta(z)| &= \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{1/4} h^{1/2} e^{-\frac{\gamma \eta^{3/2}}{h}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} E_{-+}^\eta(z) &= \left(c_+^{0,\eta}(z) c_-^{0,\eta}(z) (h\sqrt{\eta})^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{O}\left(h^{\frac{3}{2}} \eta^{-5/4}\right) \right) \\ &\cdot \left(e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+}^{x_-} (z-g(y)) dy} - e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+}^{x_-+2\pi} (z-g(y)) dy} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the prefactor of the exponentials depends only on $\text{Im } z$ and has bounded derivatives of order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h\sqrt{\eta}})$.

Proof. See [1]. (4.19) has not been stated in this form on [1]. However, it can easily be deduce from the results in [1] together with Proposition 4.8. □

Remark 4.11. The cut-off function $\chi_\pm^\eta$ in the above proposition can be chosen similarly to $\chi_{e,f}^\eta$ in Definition 3.6 (compare also with Definition 3.2).

4.4. Estimates on the effective Hamiltonians. In [12] Hager chose to represent S^1 as an interval between two of the periodically appearing minima of $\text{Im } g$ and thus chose the notation for $x_{\pm}$ accordingly (this notation was used in (4.17)). In our case however, we chose to represent S^1 as an interval between two of the periodically appearing maxima of $\text{Im } g$. This results in the following difference between notations:

$$x_+(z) = x_+^H(z) - 2\pi \quad \text{and} \quad x_-(z) = x_-^H(z).$$

Thus, in our notation, we have for $\bullet = H, \eta$

$$(4.20) \quad E_{-+}^{\bullet}(z) = V^{\bullet}(z, h) \left(e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+}^{x_- - 2\pi} (z - g(y)) dy} - e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+}^{x_-} (z - g(y)) dy} \right),$$

where $V^{\bullet} = V^{\bullet}(z, h)$ satisfies

$$(4.21) \quad V^{\bullet} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{h}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 + \mathcal{O}(h)), & \text{if } \bullet = H, \ z \in \Omega_i \\ c_+^{0,\eta}(z) c_-^{0,\eta}(z) (h\sqrt{\eta})^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-\frac{3}{2}} h\right) \right), & \text{if } \bullet = \eta, \ z \in \Omega_{\eta}^a. \end{cases}$$

Note that Taylor expansion around the point a yields

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_{\pm}) &= -2i \text{Im } g'(x_{\pm}) \\ &= 2i\sqrt{\eta} \left| \text{Im } g''(a) (\tilde{x}_{\pm}(\tilde{z}) - a/\sqrt{\eta})(1 + o_{\sqrt{\eta}}(1)) \right|, \quad \text{for } z \in \Omega_{\eta}^a. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we may write for all $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$

$$(4.23) \quad V(z, h) := V^{\bullet}(z, h) = \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{h}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-\frac{3}{2}} h\right) \right)$$

where the first order term is $\eta^{1/4}$ for $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_{\eta}^a$. Note that

$$(4.24) \quad \left| e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+}^{x_- - 2\pi} (z - g(y)) dy} - e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_+}^{x_-} (z - g(y)) dy} \right| = e^{-\frac{S}{h}} \left| 1 - e^{\Phi(z, h)} \right|,$$

where $\Phi(z, h)$ is defined already in Proposition 2.5. For the readers convenience:

$$\Phi(z, h) = \begin{cases} -\frac{2\pi i}{h} (z - \langle g \rangle), & \text{if } \text{Im } z < \langle \text{Im } g \rangle, \\ \frac{2\pi i}{h} (z - \langle g \rangle), & \text{if } \text{Im } z > \langle \text{Im } g \rangle, \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$(4.25) \quad |E_{-+}^{\bullet}(z)| = V(z, h) e^{-\frac{S}{h}} \left| 1 - e^{\Phi(z, h)} \right|.$$

The aim of this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.12. *Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$, let $\Phi(z, h)$ be as in Proposition 2.5 and let $E_{-+}(z)$ the effective Hamiltonian given in Proposition 4.1. Then, for $h > 0$ small enough, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for $h^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll \eta \leq \text{const}$.*

$$|E_{-+}(z)| = V(z, h) e^{-\frac{S(z)}{h}} \left| 1 - e^{\Phi(z, h)} \right| \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta^{3/2}}{h}}\right) \right).$$

Furthermore, for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$ the $\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta}$ derivatives of the error terms are bounded and of order

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}} h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta^{\frac{3}{2}}}{h}}\right).$$

Proof of Proposition 2.9. Recall that $(P_h - z)e_0 = \alpha_0 f_0$ (cf. (2.8)). Suppose first that $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$. By Proposition 3.11 we find

$$\begin{aligned} ((1 - \chi)(P_h - z)e_0|f_0) &= \alpha_0(f_0|(1 - \chi)f_0) \\ &= \alpha_0 \left((f_{wkb}|(1 - \chi)f_{wkb}) + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the phase of f_{wkb} has no critical point on the support of χ , it follows that there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending on χ but uniform in $z \in \Omega$, such that

$$((1 - \chi)(P_h - z)e_0|f_0) = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right).$$

By a similar argument we find that

$$((P_h - z)\chi e_0|f_0) = \alpha_0(\chi e_0|e_0) = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_0 e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right).$$

In the case where $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$, we perform a rescaling argument similar to the one in the proof of Proposition 3.11. Thus,

$$((1 - \chi)(P_h - z)e_0|f_0), ((P_h - z)\chi e_0|f_0) = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_0 \exp\left\{-\frac{\eta^{\frac{3}{2}}}{Ch}\right\}\right).$$

Note that Proposition 3.11 implies that each z - and $\bar{z}$ - derivative of the exponentially small error term increases its order of growth at most by factor of order $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2}h^{-1})$. Thus, using (2.8) yields

$$(4.26) \quad \alpha_0 = ((1 - \chi + \chi)(P_h - z)e_0|f_0) = ([\chi, P_h]e_0|f_0) + \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_0 \exp\left\{-\frac{\eta^{\frac{3}{2}}}{Ch}\right\}\right)$$

The statement of the Proposition then follows by the fact that $|\alpha_0| = |E_{-+}(z)|$ (cf. Proposition 4.1) together with Proposition 4.12. $\square$

We give some estimates on the elements of the Grushin problems introduced in Section 4.

Proposition 4.13. *Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$, let $E_{-+}^\bullet, E_\pm^\bullet, R_\pm^\bullet, E^\bullet$ be as in the Propositions 4.1, 4.9 and 4.10, where $\bullet = -, H, \eta$ with “-” symbolizing no index. Furthermore, let $S(z)$ as in Definition 2.2. Then we have the following estimates*

(1) *for $\bullet = -, H$ and for $z \in \Omega_i \subset \Omega$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta R_\pm^\bullet\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta E_\pm^\bullet\| &= \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\beta|}), \\ |\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta E_{-+}^H| &= \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-(|\beta|-\frac{1}{2})}e^{-\frac{S(z)}{h}}\right), \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta E^\bullet\| = \mathcal{O}(h^{-(|\beta|+1/2)}). \end{aligned}$$

(2) *for $\bullet = -, \eta$ and for $z \in \Omega_\eta^{a,b} \subset \Omega$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta R_\pm^\bullet\|, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta E_\pm^\bullet\| &= \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}}h^{-|\beta|}\right), \\ |\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta E_{-+}^\eta| &= \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|+1/2}{2}}h^{-(|\beta|-\frac{1}{2})}e^{-\frac{\eta^{3/2}}{h}}\right), \\ \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta E^\bullet\| &= \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|-1/2}{2}}h^{-(|\beta|+1/2)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall the definition of $R_{\pm}$ and $E_{\pm}$ given in Proposition 4.1. By the estimates on the z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivatives of e_0 and f_0 given in Proposition 3.11, we may conclude for $z \in \Omega$ that

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} E_{+}\|_{\mathbb{C} \rightarrow L^2}, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} R_{+}\|_{H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}} &\leq \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} e_0\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}} h^{-|\beta|}\right), \\ \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} E_{-}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}}, \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} R_{-}\|_{\mathbb{C} \rightarrow L^2} &\leq \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} f_0\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}} h^{-|\beta|}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and thus prove the corresponding “-”-cases in the Proposition. The estimates for the other cases of $R_{\pm}^{\bullet}$ and $E_{\pm}^{\bullet}$ then follow from (4.27), (4.28) and (4.32).

Recall from Proposition 4.1 that $\mathcal{E}(z)\mathcal{P}(z) = 1$. Thus, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z \mathcal{E}(z) + \mathcal{E}(z)(\partial_z \mathcal{P}(z))\mathcal{E}(z) &= 0, \\ \partial_{\bar{z}} \mathcal{E}(z) + \mathcal{E}(z)(\partial_{\bar{z}} \mathcal{P}(z))\mathcal{E}(z) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z E &= -E(\partial_z(P_h - z))E - E_{+}(\partial_z R_{+})E - E(\partial_z R_{-})E_{-} \\ &= E^2 - E_{+}(\partial_z R_{+})E - E(\partial_z R_{-})E_{-} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\partial_{\bar{z}} E(z) = -E_{+}(z)(\partial_{\bar{z}} R_{+})E(z) - E(z)(\partial_{\bar{z}} R_{-})E_{-}(z).$$

Thus, by induction we conclude from this, from (4.27) and from Proposition 4.1 that for $z \in \Omega$

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} E(z)\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|-1/2}{2}} h^{-(|\beta|+\frac{1}{2})}\right).$$

The estimates on $\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} E^{\bullet}(z)\|$, for $\bullet = \eta, H$, can be conclude by following the same steps and by using the corresponding estimates on $R_{\pm}^{\bullet}$ and $E_{\pm}^{\bullet}$ and the Propositions 4.9 and 4.10.

It remains to prove the estimates on $|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} E_{-+}^{\eta}(z)|$ and $|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} E_{-+}^H(z)|$: let us first consider the case where $z \in \Omega_i \subset \Omega$. Recall (4.20) and recall from Proposition 4.9 that the prefactor $V^H(z)$ has bounded z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivatives of order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h})$. Thus, the statement follows immediately.

In the case where $z \in \Omega_{\eta}^{a,b} \subset \Omega$, recall (4.20) and from Proposition 4.10 that the prefactor $V^{\eta}(z)$ has bounded z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivatives of order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h\sqrt{\eta}})$. Using that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_{+}}^{x_{-}-2\pi} (z-g(y))dy} &= e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{x_{+}}^{x_{-}} (z-g(y))dy} \\ &= e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{\tilde{x}_{+}}^{\tilde{x}_{-}-2\pi/\sqrt{\eta}} (\tilde{z}-\tilde{g}(\tilde{y}))d\tilde{y}} = e^{\frac{i}{h} \int_{\tilde{x}_{+}}^{\tilde{x}_{-}} (\tilde{z}-\tilde{g}(\tilde{y}))d\tilde{y}}, \end{aligned}$$

(3.5) implies

$$|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^{\beta} E_{-+}^{\eta}(z)| = \eta^{-|\beta|} |\partial_{\tilde{z}\tilde{z}}^{\beta} E_{-+}^{\eta}(z)| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|+1/2}{2}} h^{-(|\beta|-\frac{1}{2})} e^{\asymp \eta^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right). \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 4.12. Let $\bullet = H, \eta$ denote the quasimodes and elements of the Grushin problems corresponding to the different zones of z .

Since $\mathcal{P}^\bullet \mathcal{E}^\bullet : L^2(S^1) \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow L^2(S^1) \times \mathbb{C}$ let us introduce the following norm for an operator-valued matrix $A : L^2(S^1) \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow L^2(S^1) \times \mathbb{C}$:

$$\|A\|_\infty := \max_{1 \leq i \leq 2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \|A_{ij}\|,$$

where $\|A_{ij}\|$ denotes the respective operator norm for A_{ij} . Next, note that

$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{E}^\bullet = (\mathcal{P}^\bullet + (\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet))\mathcal{E}^\bullet = 1 + (\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet)\mathcal{E}^\bullet.$$

Estimates for $(\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet)$ Recall the definition of $\mathcal{P}$ and of $\mathcal{P}^\bullet$ from the Propositions 4.1, 4.9 and 4.10 and note that

$$\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & R_- - R_-^\bullet \\ R_+ - R_+^\bullet & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will now prove that for all $(n, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$(4.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(R_+ - R_+^\bullet)\|_{H^1(S^1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}} &\leq \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(e_0 - \chi_+^\bullet e_+^\bullet)\| \\ &= \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{1}{C}h}\right), & \text{for } z \in \Omega, \text{ dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C, \\ \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}} h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{\frac{3}{2}}{h}}\right), & \text{for } z \in \Omega_\eta^a, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the first estimate follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Note that

$$(4.29) \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(e_0 - \chi_+^\bullet e_+^\bullet)\| \leq \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(e_{wkb}^\bullet - \chi_+^\bullet e_+^\bullet)\| + \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(e_0 - e_{wkb}^\bullet)\|.$$

By Proposition 3.11 it remains to prove the desired estimate on $\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta(e_{wkb}^\bullet - \chi_+^\bullet e_+^\bullet)\|$. Recall the definition of the quasimodes $e_{wkb}^\bullet$ and $e_+^\bullet$ from Section 3 and from Proposition 4.8.

Let us first consider the case of $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$: recall from Proposition 4.9 that all z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivatives of χ_+ are bounded independently of $h > 0$, whereas for the derivatives of χ_e we have (3.15). Thus

$$\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta \chi_+, \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta \chi_e = \mathcal{O}(h^{-|\beta|/2}).$$

Thus, since $\chi_e(-; z) \succ \chi_+$ for all $z \in \bar{\Omega}_i$, which implies that $x_+(z) \notin \text{supp}(\chi_e(-; z) - \chi_+)$ for all $z \in \bar{\Omega}_i$, the Leibniz rule then implies

$$(4.30) \quad \left\| \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta \left((\chi_e(\cdot; z) - \chi_+) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)} \right) \right\| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{F}{h}}\right).$$

where $F > 0$ is given by the infimum of $\text{Im } \phi(x; z)$ over all $z \in \bar{\Omega}$ and all

$$x \in \left(\bigcup_{z \in \bar{\Omega}} \text{supp}(\chi_e(\cdot; z)) \right) \setminus \{x \in I_+ : \chi_+ \equiv 1\}.$$

Note that $F > 0$ is strictly positive because $x_-(z) \notin \bar{I}_+$ for all $z \in \bar{\Omega}$ and $\chi_+ \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(I_+)$ (cf. Propositions 4.9 and 4.8).

Recall that $h^{-1/4}a(z; h)$ and $c_+(z; h)$ are the normalization factors of e_{wkb} and e_+ (cf. (3.7) and Proposition 4.8). Hence, for $z \in \Omega_i$,

$$h^{-\frac{1}{4}}\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta a(z; h), \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta c_+(z; h) = \mathcal{O}(h^{-(|\beta|+1/2)}) .$$

Thus the Leibniz rule implies

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta c_+(z; h) - \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta h^{-1/4}a(z; h)| \\ &= \left| \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta \frac{\left\| \left(\chi_e(\cdot; z) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)} \right) \right\| - \left\| \left(\chi_+ e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)} \right) \right\|}{\left\| \left(\chi_e(\cdot; z) e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)} \right) \right\| \left\| \left(\chi_+ e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_+(\cdot; z)} \right) \right\|} \right| \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-(|\beta|+1/2)} e^{-\frac{F}{h}}\right) . \end{aligned}$$

Since $h^{-\frac{1}{4}}a(z; h), c_+(z; h) = \mathcal{O}(h^{-\frac{1}{4}})$, the Leibniz rule and the above imply that for $z \in \Omega_i$

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta (e_{wkb} - \chi_+ e_+)\| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-(|\beta|+1/2)} e^{-\frac{F}{h}}\right) .$$

Thus there exists a constant $C > 0$, for $h > 0$ small enough, such that for $z \in \Omega_i$

$$(4.31) \quad \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta (e_{wkb} - \chi_+ e_+)\| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right) .$$

Now let us consider the case $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^{a,b}$: recall the quasimodes e_{wkb}^η and e_+^η as given in Definition 3.6 and Proposition 4.8. A rescaling argument similar to the one in the proof of Proposition 3.11 then implies

$$\|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta (e_{wkb}^\eta - \chi_+^\eta e_+^\eta)\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|+3/2}{2}} h^{-(|\beta|+1/2)} e^{-\frac{\asymp_\eta \frac{3}{2}}{h}}\right) .$$

Absorbing the factor $\eta^{3/4} h^{-1/2}$ into $e^{-\frac{\asymp_\eta \frac{3}{2}}{h}}$ then yields the desired estimate.

It is possible to achieve an analogous estimate for $R_- - R_-^\bullet$, namely that for all $z \in \Omega$ and for all $(n, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$(4.32) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta (R_- - R_-^\bullet)\|_{C \rightarrow H^1(S^1)} = \|\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta (f_0 - \chi_-^\bullet e_-^\bullet)\| \\ &= \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right), & \text{for } z \in \Omega, \text{ dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C, \\ \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}} h^{-|\beta|} e^{-\frac{\asymp_\eta \frac{3}{2}}{h}}\right), & \text{for } z \in \Omega_\eta^a, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This can be achieved by analogous reasoning as for the estimate on $R_+ - R_+^\bullet$.

A formula for E_{-+} It is easy to see, that for $h > 0$ small enough

$$\|(\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet)\mathcal{E}^\bullet\|_\infty \ll 1.$$

Thus, $1 + (\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet)\mathcal{E}^\bullet$ is invertible by the Neumann series, wherefore

$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{E}^\bullet [1 + (\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet)\mathcal{E}^\bullet]^{-1} = 1.$$

We conclude that

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^\bullet \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n [(\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet)\mathcal{E}^\bullet]^n .$$

Define $g_- := R_- - R_-^\bullet$ and $g_+ := R_+ - R_+^\bullet$. Hence, by Propositions 4.9 and 4.10 as well as by (4.29) and (4.28), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet)\mathcal{E}^\bullet = \begin{pmatrix} g_- E_-^\bullet & g_- E_{-+}^\bullet \\ g_+ E_+^\bullet & g_+ E_{++}^\bullet \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right) & E_{-+}^\bullet \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right) \\ \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right) & \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By induction it follows that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$[(\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}^\bullet)\mathcal{E}^\bullet]^n = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{n}{Ch}}\right) & E_{-+}^\bullet \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{n}{Ch}}\right) \\ \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{n}{Ch}}\right) & \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{n}{Ch}}\right) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We conclude that

$$E_{-+}(z) = E_{-+}^\bullet \left(1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{n}{Ch}}\right) \right) = E_{-+}^\bullet \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right) \right).$$

Finally, by the estimates on g_+ and g_- obtained above and by the estimates given in Proposition 4.13 we conclude the desired estimates on the z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivatives of the error term. $\square$

5. GRUSHIN PROBLEM FOR THE PERTURBED OPERATOR P_h^δ

For $\delta > 0$ small enough, we can use the Grushin problem for the unperturbed operator P_h to gain a well-posed Grushin problem for the perturbed operator P_h^δ .

Proposition 5.1 ([21]). *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$, let $h^{2/3} \ll \eta \leq \text{const.}$ and let R_-, R_+ be as in Proposition 4.1. Then*

$$\mathcal{P}_\delta(z) := \begin{pmatrix} P_h^\delta - z & R_- \\ R_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} : H^1(S^1) \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow L^2(S^1) \times \mathbb{C}$$

is bijective with the bounded inverse

$$\mathcal{E}_\delta(z) = \begin{pmatrix} E_\delta^\delta(z) & E_{++}^\delta(z) \\ E_-^\delta(z) & E_{-+}^\delta(z) \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_\delta^\delta(z) &= E(z) + \mathcal{O}_{\eta^{-1/2}}(\delta h^{-2}) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4} h^{-1/2}) \\ E_-^\delta(z) &= E_-(z) + \mathcal{O}(\delta \eta^{-1/4} h^{-3/2}) = \mathcal{O}(1) \\ E_+^\delta(z) &= E_+(z) + \mathcal{O}(\delta \eta^{-1/4} h^{-3/2}) = \mathcal{O}(1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E_{-+}^\delta(z) &= E_{-+}(z) - \delta \left(E_- Q_\omega E_+ + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-\delta)^n E_- Q_\omega (E Q_\omega)^n E_+ \right) \\ (5.1) \quad &= E_{-+}(z) - \delta (E_- Q_\omega E_+ + \mathcal{O}(\delta \eta^{-1/4} h^{-5/2})) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The statement follows immediately from Proposition 4.1 by use of the Neumann series. $\square$

By (4.2) we get

$$E_- Q_\omega E_+ = \sum_{|j|, |k| \leq \lfloor \frac{C_1}{h} \rfloor} \alpha_{j,k}(e_0 | e^k) \cdot (e^j | f_0) = \sum_{|j|, |k| \leq \lfloor \frac{C_1}{h} \rfloor} \alpha_{j,k} \widehat{e}_0(k) \overline{\widehat{f}_0(j)}.$$

Recall from Proposition 1.2 that the random variables satisfy $\alpha \in B(0, C/h)$. For a more convenient notation we make the following definition:

Definition 5.2. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we shall denote the Gauss brackets by $\lfloor x \rfloor := \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : k \leq x\}$. Let $C_1 > 0$ be big enough as above and define $N := (2\lfloor \frac{C_1}{h} \rfloor + 1)^2$. For $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ let $X(z) = (X_{j,k}(z))_{|j|, |k| \leq \lfloor \frac{C_1}{h} \rfloor} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ be given by

$$X_{j,k}(z) = \widehat{e}_0(z; k) \overline{\widehat{f}_0(z; j)}, \quad \text{for } |j|, |k| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{C_1}{h} \right\rfloor.$$

Thus, for $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ and $\alpha \in B(0, C/h) \subset \mathbb{C}^N$

$$(5.2) \quad E_{-+}^\delta(z) = E_{-+}(z) - \delta [X(z) \cdot \alpha + T(z; \alpha)],$$

where the dot-product $X(z) \cdot \alpha$ is the bilinear one, and

$$(5.3) \quad T(z; \alpha) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-\delta)^n E_{-} Q_{\omega} (E Q_{\omega})^n E_{+} = \mathcal{O}(\delta \eta^{-1/4} h^{-5/2}),$$

where the estimate comes from Proposition 5.1. Note that $T(z; \alpha)$ is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ in z and holomorphic in α in a ball of radius C/h , $B(0, C/h) \subset \mathbb{C}^N$, by Proposition 1.2.

Proposition 5.3. Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$, let $X(z)$ be as in Definition 5.2. Let $h|k| \geq C$ for $C > 0$ large enough, then the Fourier coefficients satisfy

$$\widehat{e}_0(z; k), \widehat{f}_0(z; k) = \mathcal{O}\left(|k|^{-M} \text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma)^{-\frac{M}{2}}\right), \quad \text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) \gg h^{\frac{2}{3}}$$

for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular

$$\|X(z)\| = 1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty).$$

Proof. Will show the proof in the case of $e_0(z)$ since the case of $f_0(z)$ is similar. Let us first suppose that $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$. Recall the definition of the quasimode e_{wkb} given in (3.7). By Proposition 4.7

$$\widehat{e}_0(z; k) = \int \left(e_{wkb}(z; x) + \mathcal{O}_{C^\infty}\left(e^{-\frac{s}{2h}}\right) \right) e^{-ikx} dx.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, repeated integration by parts using the operator

$${}^tL := \frac{i}{k} \frac{d}{dx}$$

applied to the error term yields by Proposition 4.7 that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\widehat{e}_0(z; k) = \int e_{wkb}(z; x) e^{-ikx} dx + \mathcal{O}(|k|^{-n} h^\infty).$$

Define the phase function $\Phi(x, z) := (\phi_+(x, z)h^{-1} - kx)$. Since $h|k| \geq C$ is large enough and since Ω is relatively compact, it follows that

$$|\partial_x \Phi(x, z)| = |\partial_x \phi_+(x, z)h^{-1} - k| \geq C_1 |k| > 0.$$

Repeated integration by parts using the operator

$${}^tL' := \frac{1}{\partial_x \Phi(x, z)} D_x$$

yields that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\int e_{wkb}(z; x) e^{-ikx} dx = \mathcal{O}(|k|^{-n}).$$

Thus, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\widehat{e}_0(z; k) = \mathcal{O}(|k|^{-n}).$$

For $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$ one performs a similar rescaling argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.11. Since in the rescaled coordinates $\tilde{k} = \sqrt{\eta}k$, we conclude that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|\widehat{e}_0(k)| \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-\frac{n}{2}}|k|^{-n}).$$

Finally, by definition 5.2, Parseval identity and the estimates on the Fourier coefficients above, it follows that

$$\|X(z)\|^2 = \sum_{|j|, |k| \leq N} |\widehat{e}_0(z; j)|^2 |\widehat{f}_0(z; k)|^2 = (e_0(z)|e_0(z))(f_0(z)|f_0(z)) + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty).$$

Since $\|e_0\|, \|f_0\| = 1$, we conclude the second statement of the Proposition. $\square$

The following is an extension of Proposition 5.3.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$, let $X(z)$ be as in Definition 5.2. Let $h|k| \geq C$ for $C > 0$ large enough, then for $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) \gg h^{\frac{2}{3}}$ and for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$*

$$\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m \widehat{e}_0(z; k), \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m \widehat{f}_0(z; k) = \left(|k|^{-M} \text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma)^{-\frac{M}{2}}\right).$$

Furthermore,

$$\|\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m X(z)\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma)^{\frac{n+m}{2}} h^{-(n+m)}\right).$$

Proof. Since

$$\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m \widehat{e}_0(z; k) = \int \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m e_0(z; x) e^{-ikx} dx.$$

We then conclude similar to the proof of Proposition 5.3 that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|\partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m \widehat{e}_0(z; k)| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-\frac{N}{2}}|k|^{-N}\right).$$

The second statement of the Proposition is a direct consequence of Parseval's identity and Proposition 3.11. $\square$

6. CONNECTIONS WITH SYMPLECTIC VOLUME AND TUNNELING EFFECTS

The first two terms of the effective Hamiltonian E_{-+}^δ for the perturbed operator P_h^δ (cf. (5.2)) have a relation to the symplectic volume form on T^*S^1 and to the tunneling effects described in Section 4.2.

6.1. Link with the symplectic volume.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$ and let p and $\rho_\pm$ be as in Section 1. Let $X(z)$ be as in Definition 5.2. Then we have for $h > 0$ small enough and $h^{2/3} \ll \eta \leq \text{const}$.*

$$(\partial_z X | \partial_z X) - \frac{|(\partial_z X | X)|^2}{\|X\|^2} = \frac{1}{h} \left(\frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+(z))} - \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_-(z))} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2}),$$

where

$$|\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_\pm)| \asymp \sqrt{\eta}.$$

The $\partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta$ derivatives of the error term $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2})$ are of order $\mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}-2} h^{-\frac{|\beta|}{2}}\right)$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$, let p and $\rho_{\pm}$ be as in Section 1 and let $d\xi \wedge dx$ be the symplectic form on T^*S^1 . Then,*

$$\frac{1}{h} \left(\frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+(z))} - \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_-(z))} \right) L(dz) = \frac{1}{2h} p_*(d\xi \wedge dx)$$

Proof. See [12] or [21, Prop. 7.4]. □

To prove Proposition 6.1 we first prove the following result.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$ such that $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$ and let $g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{C})$ and $\rho_{\pm}$ be as in Section 1. Let e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} be as in (3.7) and (3.8). Let $\Pi_{e_{wkb}} : L^2(S^1) \rightarrow L^2(S^1)$ and $\Pi_{f_{wkb}} : L^2(S^1) \rightarrow L^2(S^1)$ denote the orthogonal projections onto the subspaces spanned by e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} respectively. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - \Pi_{e_{wkb}})\partial_z e_{wkb}(\cdot; z)\|^2 &= \frac{-1}{2h \text{Im } g'(x_+(z))} + \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \|(1 - \Pi_{f_{wkb}})\partial_{\bar{z}} f_{wkb}(\cdot; z)\|^2 &= \frac{1}{2h \text{Im } g'(x_-(z))} + \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.4. In the following, we shall regard z as a fixed parameter. Hence, by the support of functions depending on both x and z we mean the support with respect to the variable x .

Proof. We will consider only the case of e_{wkb} since the case of f_{wkb} is similar. One calculates

$$\begin{aligned} (6.1) \quad \partial_z e_{wkb}(x; z) &= h^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left\{ \partial_z \chi_e(x; z) a(z; h) + \chi_e(x; z) \partial_z a(z; h) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \chi_e(x; z) a(z; h) \frac{i}{h} \partial_z \phi_+(x; z) \right\} e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+(x; z)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (6.2) \quad (\partial_z e_{wkb}|_{e_{wkb}}) &= h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int \left((\partial_z \chi_e(x; z)) |a(z; h)|^2 + (\partial_z a(z; h)) \overline{a(z; h)} \chi_e(x; z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |a(z; h)|^2 \chi_e(x; z) \frac{i}{h} \partial_z \phi_+(x; z) \right) \chi_e(x; z) e^{-\frac{\Phi(x; z)}{h}} dx, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(6.3) \quad \Phi(x; z) := -i(\phi_+(x; z) - \overline{\phi_+(x; z)}) = 2\text{Im} \int_{x_+(z)}^x (z - g(y)) dy.$$

First, we will compute

$$(6.4) \quad h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int (\partial_z \chi_e(x; z)) \chi_e(x; z) |a(z; h)|^2 e^{-\frac{\Phi(x; z)}{h}} dx.$$

Using (3.15) and the fact that $\partial_z \chi_e(z, \cdot)$ has support in $]x_- - 2\pi, x_- - 2\pi + h^{1/2}[\cup]x_- - h^{1/2}, x_-[$, Taylor expansion of $\Phi(\cdot, z)$ at x_- and $x_- - 2\pi$ yields that

$$e^{-\frac{\Phi(x; z)}{h}} \leq \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right),$$

uniformly in $]x_- - 2\pi, x_- - 2\pi + h^{1/2}[\cup]x_- - h^{1/2}, x_-[$. Here S is as in Definition 2.2. Now, applying this and (3.15) to (6.4), yields

$$(6.5) \quad h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|a(z; h)|^2 \int \partial_z \chi_e(x; z) \chi_e(x; z) e^{-\frac{\Phi(x; z)}{h}} dx = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}\right).$$

Next, we will treat the other two contributions to (6.2). First, consider

$$h^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\partial_z a(z; h)) \overline{a(z; h)} \int \chi_e(x; z)^2 e^{-\frac{\Phi(x; z)}{h}} dx.$$

Since $h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|a(z; h)|^2$ is the normalization factor of $\|e_{wkb}\|^2$ we see that

$$(6.6) \quad h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \partial_z a(z; h) \overline{a(z; h)} \int \chi_e(x; z)^2 e^{-\frac{\Phi(x; z)}{h}} dx = \frac{\partial_z a(z; h)}{a(z; h)}.$$

Let us now turn to the third contribution to (6.2)

$$I_h := h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|a(z; h)|^2 \int \frac{i}{h} \partial_z \phi_+(x; z) \chi_e(x; z)^2 e^{-\frac{\Phi(x; z)}{h}} dx.$$

The stationary phase method implies together with (3.10) that

$$(6.7) \quad I_h = \frac{i}{h} \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z) + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Thus, by combining (6.5), (6.6) and (6.7)

$$(\partial_z e_{wkb}|e_{wkb}) = \frac{i}{h} \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z) + \mathcal{O}(1)$$

and thus

$$(6.8) \quad (\partial_z e_{wkb}|e_{wkb}) e_{wkb}(x; z) = h^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left\{ a(z; h) \frac{i}{h} \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z) + \mathcal{O}(1) \right\} \chi_e(x; z) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+(x; z)}.$$

Subtract (6.8) from (6.1) and note that the term $a(z; h) \partial_z \chi_e(x; z) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+(x; z)}$ is exponentially small in h like in (6.5). Thus

$$(6.9) \quad (1 - \Pi_{e_{wkb}}) \partial_z e_{wkb}(x; z) = \frac{e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+(x; z)}}{h^{1/4}} \left\{ a(z; h) \chi_e(x; z) \frac{i}{h} (\partial_z \phi_+(x; z) - \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z)) \right\} + \mathcal{O}_{L^2}(1).$$

It remains to treat

$$(6.10) \quad I_h := \left\| a(z; h) \chi_e(x; z) \frac{i}{h^{\frac{5}{4}}} (\partial_z \phi_+(x; z) - \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z)) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_+(x; z)} \right\|^2 \\ = h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int \chi_e(x; z)^2 |a(z; h)|^2 \left| \frac{i}{h} (\partial_z \phi_+(x; z) - \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z)) \right|^2 e^{-\frac{\Phi(x; z)}{h}} dx,$$

where $\Phi(x; z)$ is given in (6.3). This can be done by the stationary phase method, as in the proof of Lemma 3.3. Thus

$$I_h = \sqrt{2\pi} \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{h}{2}\right)^n (\Delta_y^n u)(0) + \mathcal{O}(h^{N+1}),$$

where

$$u(y) = \chi_e(\kappa^{-1}(y); z)^2 \frac{|a(z; h)|^2}{|\kappa'(\kappa^{-1}(y))|} \left| \frac{i}{h} (\partial_z \phi_+(\kappa^{-1}(y); z) - \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z)) \right|^2$$

and $\kappa : V \rightarrow U$ is a local $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ diffeomorphism from $V \subset \mathbb{R}$, a neighborhood of $x_+(z)$, to $U \subset \mathbb{R}$, a neighborhood of 0, such that

$$\Phi(\kappa^{-1}(x); z) = \Phi(x_+(z); z) + \frac{x^2}{2},$$

$\kappa^{-1}(0) = x_+(z)$ and

$$(6.11) \quad \frac{d\kappa}{dx}(x_+(z)) = |\partial_{xx}^2 \Phi(x_+(z); z)|^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{-2\text{Im } g'(x_+(z))} \neq 0.$$

This implies that $u(0) = 0$ and thus we have to calculate the second order term in the above asymptotics, i.e. $\Delta_y u(y)$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\Delta_y \chi_e(\kappa^{-1}(y); z)^2 \frac{|a(z; h)|^2}{|\kappa'(\kappa^{-1}(y))|} \right) \left| \frac{i}{h} (\partial_z \phi_+(\kappa^{-1}(y); z) - \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z)) \right|^2 \\ & + 2 \frac{d}{dy} \left(\chi_e(\kappa^{-1}(y); z)^2 \frac{|a(z; h)|^2}{|\kappa'(\kappa^{-1}(y))|} \right) \frac{d}{dy} \frac{1}{h^2} |\partial_z \phi_+(\kappa^{-1}(y); z) - \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z)|^2 \\ & + \chi_e(\kappa^{-1}(y); z)^2 \frac{|a(z; h)|^2}{|\kappa'(\kappa^{-1}(y))|} \Delta_y \left(\left| \frac{i}{h} (\partial_z \phi_+(\kappa^{-1}(y); z) - \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z)) \right|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that at $y = 0$ the first and the second term of the right hand side vanish. By (3.33)

$$\Delta_y \left(\left| \frac{i}{h} (\partial_z \phi_+(\kappa^{-1}(y); z) - \partial_z \phi_+(x_+(z); z)) \right|^2 \right) \Big|_{y=0} = 2h^{-2} \left| \frac{d}{dy} \kappa^{-1}(0) \right|^2.$$

Thus, since $\chi_e(\kappa^{-1}(0); z) = \chi_e(x_+(z); z) = 1$ (cf. Definition 3.2),

$$(\Delta_y u)(0) = \frac{2|a(z; h)|^2}{h^2 |\kappa'(x_+(z))|^3}.$$

Using (6.11) and (3.10), we have that

$$(\Delta_y u)(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} h^2} (-\text{Im } g'(x_+(z)))^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(h^{-1})$$

which yields

$$I_h = \frac{-1}{2h \text{Im } g'(x_+(z))} + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

This, together with (6.9), yields

$$\|(1 - \Pi_{e_{wkb}}) \partial_z e_{wkb}(-; z)\|^2 = \frac{-1}{2h \text{Im } g'(x_+(z))} + \mathcal{O}(1). \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Recall that $e_0(z)$ (respectively $f_0(z)$) denotes an eigenfunction of the z -dependent operator $Q(z)$ (respectively $\tilde{Q}(z)$). Using Definition

5.2, Proposition 5.3, Corollary 5.4 and the Parseval identity one computes that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_z X | \partial_z X) - \frac{|(\partial_z X | X)|^2}{\|X\|^2} &= \\ &= (\partial_z e_0 | \partial_z e_0) - |(\partial_z e_0 | e_0)|^2 + (\partial_{\bar{z}} f_0 | \partial_{\bar{z}} f_0) - |(f_0 | \partial_{\bar{z}} f_0)|^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$. By Corollary 3.13 it then follows that $(\partial_z e_0 | \partial_z e_0) - |(\partial_z e_0 | e_0)|^2$ is equal to

$$(\partial_z e_{wkb} | \partial_z e_{wkb}) - |(\partial_z e_{wkb} | e_{wkb})|^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-1}e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}}\right).$$

Let $\Pi_{e_{wkb}}$ and $\Pi_{f_{wkb}}$ be as in Lemma 6.3 and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - \Pi_{e_{wkb}})\partial_z e_{wkb}\|^2 &= \|\partial_z e_{wkb}\|^2 - |(\partial_z e_{wkb} | e_{wkb})|^2 \quad \text{and} \\ (6.12) \quad \|(1 - \Pi_{f_{wkb}})\partial_{\bar{z}} f_{wkb}\|^2 &= \|\partial_{\bar{z}} f_{wkb}\|^2 - |(\partial_{\bar{z}} f_{wkb} | f_{wkb})|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_z X | \partial_z X) - \frac{|(\partial_z X | X)|^2}{\|X\|^2} &= \|(1 - \Pi_{e_{wkb}})\partial_z e_{wkb}\|^2 + \|(1 - \Pi_{f_{wkb}})\partial_{\bar{z}} f_{wkb}\|^2 \\ (6.13) \quad &+ \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-1}e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}} + h^\infty\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_\pm) = -2i\text{Im } g'(x_\pm)$, it follows by Lemma 6.3 and (6.13) that

$$(6.14) \quad (\partial_z X | \partial_z X) - \frac{|(\partial_z X | X)|^2}{\|X\|^2} = \frac{1}{h} \left(\frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+(z))} - \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_-(z))} \right) + \mathcal{O}(1)$$

Now let us consider the case where $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_\eta^a$. Similar to Lemma 6.3 we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - \Pi_{e_{wkb}^\eta})\partial_{\bar{z}} e_{wkb}^\eta(\cdot; \tilde{z})\|_{L^2(S^1/\sqrt{\eta}, \sqrt{\eta}d\tilde{x})}^2 &= \frac{-1}{2\tilde{h}\text{Im } g'(x_+(z))} + \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \|(1 - \Pi_{f_{wkb}^\eta})\partial_{\bar{z}} f_{wkb}^\eta(\cdot; \tilde{z})\|_{L^2(S^1/\sqrt{\eta}, \sqrt{\eta}d\tilde{x})}^2 &= \frac{1}{2\tilde{h}\text{Im } g'(x_-(z))} + \mathcal{O}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $|\text{Im } g'(x_\pm(z))| \asymp \sqrt{\eta}$. A rescaling argument similar to the one in the proof of Proposition 3.11 and Corollary 3.13 then imply

$$(\partial_z e_0 | \partial_z e_0) - |(\partial_z e_0 | e_0)|^2 = \frac{-1}{2\tilde{h}\text{Im } g'(x_+(z))} + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2})$$

and similar for $(\partial_{\bar{z}} f_0 | \partial_{\bar{z}} f_0) - |(f_0 | \partial_{\bar{z}} f_0)|^2$. Hence,

$$(\partial_z X | \partial_z X) - \frac{|(\partial_z X | X)|^2}{\|X\|^2} = \frac{1}{h} \left(\frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+(z))} - \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_-(z))} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2})$$

with $|\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_\pm(z))| \asymp \sqrt{\eta}$. The statement on the derivatives of the error estimates follow by the Stationary phase method and the usual rescaling argument. $\square$

6.2. Link with the tunneling effects. We will prove the following result in the light of Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 6.5. *Let $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma$, let $X(z)$ be as in Definition 5.2 and let $E_{-+}(z)$ be as in Proposition 4.1. Let S be as in Definition 2.2. Then,*

$$\left| \partial_z E_{-+}(z) - E_{-+}(z) \frac{(\partial_z X(z) | X(z))}{\|X(z)\|^2} - (e_0 | f_0) \right| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(h^\infty e^{-\frac{S}{\hbar}}\right).$$

Proof of Proposition 6.5. Apply the ∂_z derivative to the first equation in (2.8),

$$(P_h - z)\partial_z e_0 - e_0 = \partial_z \alpha_0 \cdot f_0 + \alpha_0 \partial_z f_0.$$

Taking the scalar product with f_0 (which is L^2 -normalized) then yields

$$(\partial_z e_0 | (P_h - z)^* f_0) - (e_0 | f_0) = \partial_z \alpha_0 + \alpha_0 (\partial_z f_0 | f_0).$$

Recall from Proposition 4.1 that $E_{-+}(z) = -\alpha_0(z)$ and use the second equation in (2.8) to see

$$(6.15) \quad \partial_z E_{-+}(z) - E_{-+}(z)((\partial_z e_0 | e_0) - (\partial_z f_0 | f_0)) - (e_0 | f_0) = 0.$$

By Definition 5.2 we have the following identity

$$(\partial_z X | X) = \sum_{|j|, |k| < \frac{C_1}{h}} \left(\partial_z \widehat{e}_0(z; j) \overline{\widehat{f}_0(z; k)} + \widehat{e}_0(z; j) \overline{\partial_z \widehat{f}_0(z; k)} \right) \left(\overline{\widehat{e}_0(z; j)} \widehat{f}_0(z; k) \right).$$

Proposition 5.3, Corollary 5.4 and the Parseval identity then imply

$$(6.16) \quad \frac{(\partial_z X | X)}{\|X\|^2} = (\partial_z e_0 | e_0) + (f_0 | \partial_z f_0) + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty).$$

Note that in the above we also used that e_0 and f_0 are normalized. Since $(f_0 | \partial_z f_0) = -(\partial_z f_0 | f_0)$ we conclude by the triangular inequality

$$\left| \partial_z E_{-+}(z) - E_{-+}(z) \frac{(\partial_z X(z) | X(z))}{\|X(z)\|^2} - (e_0 | f_0) \right| \leq \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) |E_{-+}(z)|.$$

The statement of the proposition then follows by the estimate $|E_{-+}(z)| = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{\frac{1}{4}} h^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{s}{h}}\right)$ given in Proposition 4.6. $\square$

7. PREPARATIONS FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF EIGENVALUES OF P_h^δ

To calculate the intensity measure of Ξ we make use of the following observations:

7.1. Counting zeros.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be open and convex and let $g, F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be C^∞ such that $g \not\equiv 0$ and*

$$(7.1) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}} g(z) + \partial_{\bar{z}} F(z) \cdot g(z) = 0$$

holds for all $z \in \Omega$. The zeros of g form a discrete set of locally finite multiplicity. The notion of multiplicity here is the same as for holomorphic functions, more details can be found in the proof. Furthermore, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$

$$\left\langle \chi \left(\frac{g}{\varepsilon} \right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z g|^2, \varphi \right\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{z \in g^{-1}(0)} \varphi(z), \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\chi \geq 0$ and $\int \chi(w) L(dw) = 1$ and the zeros are counted according to their multiplicities.

Proof. (7.1) implies that

$$(7.2) \quad e^{F(z)} g(z)$$

is holomorphic in Ω . g has the same zeros as the holomorphic function (7.2). Thus, the zeros of g in Ω form a discrete set and the notion of the multiplicity of the zeros of g is well-defined since we can view the zeros as those of a holomorphic function.

Let $z_0 \in g^{-1}(0)$ have multiplicity n . There exists a neighborhood $W \subset \Omega$ of z_0 such that $W \cap g^{-1}(0) = z_0$. Since $e^{F(z)}g(z)$ is holomorphic, there exists a neighborhood $U \subset \Omega$ of z_0 and a holomorphic function $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that for all $z \in U$

$$f(z) \neq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad e^{F(z)}g(z) = f(z)(z - z_0)^n.$$

Choose a $\lambda > 0$ such that $|e^{-F(z)}f(z) - e^{-F(z_0)}f(z_0)| < |e^{-F(z_0)}f(z_0)|$ for $|z - z_0| < \lambda$. In this disk we can define a single-valued branch of $\sqrt[n]{e^{-F(z)}f(z)}$.

We take a test function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ with

$$(7.3) \quad \text{supp } \varphi \subset (U \cap W \cap \{z : |z - z_0| < \lambda\}) =: N$$

and consider for $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\left\langle \chi\left(\frac{g}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z g|^2, \varphi \right\rangle = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \int_N \chi\left(\frac{g(z)}{\varepsilon}\right) |\partial_z g(z)|^2 \varphi(z) L(dz).$$

Let us perform a change of variables. Define

$$(7.4) \quad w := g(z) = (z - z_0)^n e^{-F(z)} f(z),$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z w(z) &= (z - z_0)^{n-1} e^{-F(z)} (n f(z) + (z - z_0)(\partial_z f(z) - \partial_z F(z) f(z))), \\ \partial_{\bar{z}} w(z_0) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

the implicit function theorem implies that we can invert equation (7.4) for z in a small neighborhood of z_0 without $\{z_0\}$, say the disk $D(z_0, r) \setminus \{z_0\}$ for some radius $r > 0$, and w in the n -fold covering surface of $w(D(z_0, r) \setminus \{z_0\})$. Thus, if we denote the domain on each leaf of the covering by B_k , for $k = 1, \dots, n$, as a subset of $\mathbb{C}$, and the respective branch of g by g_k we get for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough

$$\left\langle \chi\left(\frac{g}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z g|^2, \varphi \right\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \int_{B_k} \varphi(g_k^{-1}(w)) \chi\left(\frac{w}{\varepsilon}\right) (1 + \mathcal{O}(w^2)) L(dw),$$

with $g_k^{-1}(0) = z_0$. In the above we used that

$$L(dw) = (|\partial_z g(z)|^2 - |\partial_{\bar{z}} g(z)|^2) Ld(z)$$

and the $\bar{\partial}$ -equation (7.1) which implies

$$|\partial_{\bar{z}} g(z)|^2 = |\partial_{\bar{z}} F(z) g(z)|^2 \asymp w^2.$$

Thus we can conclude

$$(7.5) \quad \left\langle \chi\left(\frac{g}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z g|^2, \varphi \right\rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{k=1}^n \varphi(z(0)) = n\varphi(z_0), \quad \text{for } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Since g has at most countably many zeros in Ω , there exists some index set $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that we can denote the set of zeros of g in Ω by $\{z_i\}_{i \in I} := g^{-1}(0) \cap \Omega$. Furthermore, let $m(i)$ for all $i \in I$ denote the multiplicity of the respective zero z_i . For each zero z_i we can construct a neighborhood N_i , as above, such that for a test function with support in N_i we have the convergence as in (7.5). By potentially shrinking the N_i we can gain $N_i \cap N_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Consider the following locally finite open covering of Ω

$$\Omega = \left(\bigcup_{i \in I} N_i \right) \cup (\Omega \setminus \{z_i : i \in I\}).$$

Let $\{\chi_i\}_{i \in I \cup \{0\}}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to this open covering such that

$$1 = \sum_{i \in I} \chi_i + \chi_0.$$

Here $\chi_i \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(N_i)$ and $\chi_i \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of z_i for all $i \in I$. Furthermore, $\chi_0 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $z_i \notin \text{supp } \chi_0$ for all $i \in I$. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ be an arbitrary test function. By (7.5) we have for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$\left\langle \chi \left(\frac{g}{\varepsilon} \right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z g|^2, \varphi \right\rangle = \sum_{i \in I} \left\langle \chi \left(\frac{g}{\varepsilon} \right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z g|^2, \chi_i \varphi \right\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{i \in I} m(i) \chi_i(z_i) \varphi(z_i).$$

Since $g(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \text{supp } \chi_0$ we have for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough

$$\left\langle \chi \left(\frac{g}{\varepsilon} \right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z g|^2, \chi_0 \varphi \right\rangle = 0$$

and we can conclude the statement of the Lemma. $\square$

7.2. An implicit function theorem.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $R > 0$ and $a > c \geq 0$ be constants. Let $D(0, R) \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the open disk of radius R centered at 0 and let $g, f : D(0, R) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be holomorphic such that*

$$(7.6) \quad \|g\|_\infty \leq c, \quad \text{and for all } z \in D(0, R) : \partial_z f(z) = a + g(z).$$

Assume that

$$\xi \in D(f(0), (a - c)R) \subset \mathbb{C}.$$

Then the equation

$$f(z) = \xi$$

has exactly one solution $z = z(\xi) \in D(0, R)$ and it depends holomorphically on ξ .

Proof. For $z \in D(0, R)$

$$f(z) = \int_0^z (a + g(w)) dw + f(0) = az + f(0) + G(z),$$

where $G(z) := \int_0^z g(w) dw$. Now let us consider the equation

$$az + f(0) - \xi = 0.$$

It has a unique solution in the disk $D(0, R)$ since

$$\frac{|\xi - f(0)|}{a} < \frac{|a - c|}{a} R < R.$$

Now consider for $\varepsilon > 0$ and for $z \in D(0, R - \varepsilon)$ the equation

$$f(z) - \xi = az + f(0) - \xi + G(z) = 0.$$

Recall that $\xi \in D(f(0), (a - c)R)$ which implies that there exists a $\varepsilon(\xi) > 0$ such that $|\xi - f(0)| \leq (a - c)(R - \varepsilon(\xi))$. Thus for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(\xi)$

$$|az + f(0) - \xi| \geq |az| - |f(0) - \xi| > a|z| - (a - c)(R - \varepsilon)$$

and, using that $|G(z)| \leq c|z|$, we may conclude that for $|z| = R - \varepsilon$

$$|G(z)| < |az + f(0) - \xi|.$$

By Rouché's theorem we have that $az + f(0) - \xi$ and $f(z) - \xi$ have the same number of zeros in the disk $D(0, R - \varepsilon)$. We also see that $f(z) - \xi$ has no zero in $D(0, R) \setminus D(0, R - \varepsilon)$ and the result follows. $\square$

Proposition 7.3. *Let $a > c \geq 0$ be constants, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be open, bounded and of the form*

$$\Omega = \{z = (z', z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n : z' \in \Omega', |z_n| < R_{z'}\}$$

where $R_{z'} > 0$ is continuous in z' . Furthermore, assume that

- $g, F : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are holomorphic such that

$$(7.7) \quad \|g\|_\infty \leq c, \quad \text{and for all } z \in \Omega : \partial_{z_n} F(z) = a + g(z),$$

- $\Gamma \Subset \Omega'$ is open so that $\inf_{z' \in \Gamma} R_{z'} \geq \text{const.} > 0$,
- $\xi \in \bigcap_{z' \in \Gamma} D(F(z'), 0), (a - c)R_{z'} \subset \mathbb{C}$.

Then, when $z' \in \Gamma$, the equation

$$F(z', z_n) = \xi$$

has exactly one solution $z_n(z', \xi) \in D(0, R_{z'})$ and it depends holomorphically on ξ and on $z' \in \Gamma$.

Proof. Lemma 7.2 implies the existence and uniqueness of the solutions $z_n(z', \xi)$ in each disk $D(0, R_{z'})$. By (7.7) it follows that

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_n}(z', z_n(z', \xi)) \neq 0$$

for all $z' \in \Gamma$ and all $\xi \in D(F(z'), 0), (a - c)(R_{z'} - \lambda)$. Hence, the implicit function theorem implies that $z_n(z', \xi)$ depends holomorphically on ξ and z' . $\square$

8. A FORMULA FOR THE INTENSITY MEASURE OF THE POINT PROCESS OF EIGENVALUES OF P_h^δ

We prove the following formula for the intensity measure of Ξ :

Proposition 8.1. *Let $h^{2/3} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$ and let $\Omega := \Omega_\eta^a \Subset \Sigma$. Let $C > 0$ and let $C_1 > 0$ be as in (1.7) such that $C - C_1 > 0$ is large enough. Let δ be as in Definition 2.6 with $\kappa > 4$, define $N := (2\lfloor C_1/h \rfloor + 1)^2$ and let $B(0, R) \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be the ball of radius $R := Ch^{-1}$ centered at zero. For $z \in \Omega$ let $X(z)$ be as in Definition 5.2, let $E_{-+}(z)$ be as in Proposition 4.1 and let e_0 and f_0 be as in (2.7) and (2.9). There exist functions*

$$(8.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi(z; h, \delta) &= (\partial_z X | \partial_z X) - \frac{1}{\|X\|^2} |(\partial_z X | X)|^2 \\ &\quad + \delta^{-2} |(e_0 | f_0)(1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4} \delta^2 h^{-7/2})|^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3 h^{-3}), \end{aligned}$$

$$(8.2) \quad \Theta(z; h, \delta) = \frac{|E_{-+}(z) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2 \eta^{-1/4} h^{-5/2})|^2}{\delta^2 \|X(z)\|^2},$$

and $D > 0$ and $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ and for $h > 0$ small enough

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Xi(\varphi) \mathbf{1}_{B(0, R)}] &= \int \varphi(z) \frac{1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta \eta^{-1/4} h^{-3/2})}{\pi \|X\|^2} \Psi(z; h, \delta) e^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)} L(dz) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4}\delta h^{-3/2})$ is independent of φ and $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}})$ means $\langle T_h, \varphi \rangle$ where $T_h \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{C})$ such that $|\langle T_h, \varphi \rangle| \leq C\|\varphi\|_\infty e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}}$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Omega)$ where C and D is independent of h, δ, η and φ . Moreover, the estimates in (8.1) and (8.2) are stable under application of $\eta^{-\frac{n+m}{2}} h^{n+m} \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m$.

Proof. Step I Recall from Section 4.1 that $\sigma(P_h^\delta) = (E_{-+}^\delta)^{-1}(0)$, thus Ξ (cf. Definition 2.10) satisfies

$$\Xi = \sum_{z \in (E_{-+}^\delta)^{-1}(0)} \delta_z.$$

It has been proven in [21], that $E_{-+}^\delta(z)$ satisfies (7.1). Let χ be as in Lemma 7.1 then by Lemma 7.1, Fubini's theorem and the dominated convergence theorem we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{z \in (E_{-+}^\delta)^{-1}(0)} \varphi(z) \mathbf{1}_{B(0,R)} \right] = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \varphi(z) \left(\int_{B(0,R)} D(z, \alpha) L(d\alpha) \right) L(dz),$$

(8.3) where $D(z, \alpha) = \pi^{-N} \chi \left(\frac{E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha)}{\varepsilon} \right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha)|^2 e^{-\alpha \bar{\alpha}}.$

Step II Next we give an estimate on $\partial_z E_{-+}^\delta(z)$. By (5.2)

$$(8.4) \quad \partial_z E_{-+}^\delta(z) = \partial_z E_{-+}(z) - \delta (\partial_z X(z) \cdot \alpha + \partial_z T(z; \alpha)),$$

where the derivative ∂_z acts on $X(z)$ component wise and the dot-product $\partial_z X(z) \cdot \alpha$ is bilinear. To estimate $\partial_z T(z; \alpha)$, recall (5.3) and consider the derivative

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z E_- Q_\omega (EQ_\omega)^n E_+ &= (\partial_z E_-) Q_\omega (EQ_\omega)^n E_+ \\ &+ E_- Q_\omega \left[\sum_{j=1}^n (EQ_\omega)^{j-1} (\partial_z E) Q_\omega (EQ_\omega)^{n-j} \right] E_+ + E_- Q_\omega (EQ_\omega)^n (\partial_z E_+), \end{aligned}$$

with the convention $(EQ_\omega)^0 = 1$. Recall the Grushin problem from Proposition 4.1 and take the derivative with respect to z of the relation $\mathcal{E}(z)\mathcal{P}(z) = 1$ to obtain

$$\partial_z \mathcal{E}(z) + \mathcal{E}(z)(\partial_z \mathcal{P}(z))\mathcal{E}(z) = 0.$$

A direct calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z E &= -E(\partial_z(P_h - z))E - E_+(\partial_z R_+)E - E(\partial_z R_-)E_- \\ &= E^2 - E_+(\partial_z R_+)E - E(\partial_z R_-)E_-. \end{aligned}$$

Recall the definition of R_+ and R_- given in (4.1). By the estimates on the z - and $\bar{z}$ - derivatives of e_0 and f_0 given in Lemma 3.11, we conclude that

$$\|\partial_z R_+\|_{H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}}, \|\partial_z R_-\|_{\mathbb{C} \rightarrow L^2} = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2} h^{-1}).$$

Similarly, we have the same estimates on $\|\partial_z E_+\|_{\mathbb{C} \rightarrow L^2}$ and $\|\partial_z E_-\|_{H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}}$. Thus, since $\|E(z)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} = \mathcal{O}((h\sqrt{\eta})^{-1/2})$ and $\|E_\pm\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$, we have

$$\|\partial_z E\|_{L^2 \rightarrow H^1} = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4} h^{-3/2}).$$

Putting all of this together, we get that the series of $\partial_z T(z; \alpha)$ converges again geometrically and we gain the estimate

$$(8.5) \quad \partial_z T(z; \alpha) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4} \delta h^{-7/2}).$$

Analogously, we conclude for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$(8.6) \quad \eta^{-\frac{|\beta|}{2}} h^{|\beta|} \partial_{z\bar{z}}^\beta T(z; \alpha) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4} \delta h^{-5/2}).$$

Thus,

$$\partial_z E_{-+}^\delta(z) = \partial_z E_{-+}(z) - \delta \partial_z X(z) \cdot \alpha + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4} \delta h^{-7/2}).$$

Step III Consider the integral (8.3) and choose vectors $e_1, e_2, \dots \in \mathbb{C}^N$ as a basis of the α -space such that $e_1 = \bar{X}/\|\bar{X}\|$ and such that e_1, e_2 and $\bar{X}/\|\bar{X}\|, \partial_z \bar{X}$ span the same space: Therefore, we perform a unitary transformation in the α -space such that with a slight abuse of notion

$$(8.7) \quad \alpha = \alpha_1 \frac{\bar{X}(z)}{\|X(z)\|} + \alpha_2 b \left(\frac{\overline{\partial_z X(z)}}{\|\partial_z X(z)\|} - \frac{\overline{(\partial_z X(z)|X(z))X(z)}}{\|\partial_z X(z)\| \|X(z)\|^2} \right) + \alpha^\perp,$$

where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\alpha^\perp \in \mathbb{C}^{N-3}$ and $b > 0$ is a factor of normalization,

$$(8.8) \quad b = \frac{\|\partial_z X(z)\| \|X(z)\|}{\sqrt{\|\partial_z X(z)\|^2 \|X(z)\|^2 - |(\partial_z X(z)|X(z))|^2}}.$$

This change of variables is well defined by Lemma 6.1. In the following we will also use the notation $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha^\perp) = (\alpha_1, \alpha')$. This choice of basis yields by (5.3) and (5.2)

$$(8.9) \quad E_{-+}^\delta(z) = E_{-+}(z) - \delta \|X(z)\| \alpha_1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4} \delta^2 h^{-5/2})$$

and by (8.4), (8.7), (8.8)

$$(8.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_z E_{-+}^\delta(z) &= \partial_z E_{-+}(z) - \delta \frac{(\partial_z X(z)|X(z))}{\|X(z)\|} \alpha_1 \\ &\quad - \delta \left(\|\partial_z X(z)\|^2 - \frac{|(\partial_z X(z)|X(z))|^2}{\|X(z)\|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_2 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4} \delta^2 h^{-7/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Now let us split the ball $B(0, R)$, $R = Ch^{-1}$, into two pieces: pick $C_0 > 0$ such that $0 < C_1 < C_0 < C$ and define $R_0 := C_0 h^{-1}$. Then we shall consider one piece such that $\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0$ and the other such that $\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} > R_0$. Hence, (8.3) is equal to

$$(8.11) \quad \begin{aligned} &\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \varphi(z) \int_{\substack{B(0,R) \\ \|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0}} D(z, \alpha) L(d\alpha) L(dz) + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \varphi(z) \int_{\substack{B(0,R) \\ \|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} > R_0}} D(z, \alpha) L(d\alpha) L(dz) \\ &=: I_1(\varphi) + I_2(\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Step IV In this step we will calculate $I_1(\varphi)$ of (8.11). There we perform a change of variables such that $\beta := E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha)$ is one of them. Due to (8.9) it is natural to express α_1 as a function of β and α' . To this purpose we will apply Proposition 7.3 to the function $E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha)$:

$E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha_1, \alpha')$ is holomorphic in α in ball of radius $R = Ch^{-1}$ centered at 0. Here, α plays the role of z in the Proposition, in particular α_1 plays the role of z_n . Recall

(5.2) and note that since $T(z; \alpha) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4}\delta h^{-5/2})$ (cf. (5.3)) we can conclude by the Cauchy inequalities that

$$\partial_{\alpha_1} \delta T(z; \alpha) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4}\delta^2 h^{-3/2})$$

which implies

$$(8.12) \quad \partial_{\alpha_1} E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha_1, \alpha') = -\delta \|X(z)\| + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4}\delta^2 h^{-3/2}).$$

By Proposition 5.3 we have that $\|X(z)\| = 1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$ which implies that

$$\partial_{\alpha_1} E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha_1, \alpha') = -\delta (1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty + \eta^{-1/4}\delta h^{-3/2})).$$

Hence, $E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha)$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 7.3. Since we restricted α' to $\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0$ and since

$$|\alpha_1| < R^2 - \|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} =: R_{\alpha'},$$

it follows by Proposition 7.3 that for

$$(8.13) \quad \beta \in \bigcap_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0} D(E_{-+}^\delta(z; 0, \alpha'), r_{\alpha'})$$

with

$$(8.14) \quad r_{\alpha'} \geq \delta (1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty + \eta^{-1/4}\delta h^{-3/2})) \frac{\sqrt{C^2 - C_0^2}}{h} \geq \frac{\delta h^{-1}}{\mathcal{O}(1)} > 0.$$

and $h > 0$ small enough, $\beta = E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha_1, \alpha')$ has exactly one solution $\alpha_1(\beta, \alpha')$ in the disk $D(0, R_{\alpha'})$ and it depends holomorphically on β and α' . More precisely,

$$(8.15) \quad \alpha_1(\beta, \alpha') = \frac{-\beta + E_{-+}(z) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4}\delta^2 h^{-5/2})}{\delta \|X(z)\|}.$$

Furthermore,

$$L(d\alpha) = |\partial_{\alpha_1} E_{-+}^\delta|^{-2} L(d\beta) L(d\alpha').$$

Since the support of χ is compact, we can restrict our attention to β and $E_{-+}^\delta(z; 0, \alpha')$ in a small disk of radius $\varepsilon > 0$ centered at 0. By choosing $\varepsilon < \delta h^{-1}/C$, $C > 0$ large enough, as in (8.14) we see that $\beta, E_{-+}^\delta(z; 0, \alpha') \in D(0, \varepsilon)$ implies (8.13). By performing this change of variables and by picking $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough as above, we get

$$(8.16) \quad I_1(\varphi) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \varphi(z) \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{C}} \chi\left(\frac{\beta}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \Lambda(\beta; z) L(d\beta) \right\} L(dz),$$

where $\Lambda(\beta; z)$ depends smoothly on z and on β and, using (8.10), is given by

$$(8.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \Lambda(\beta, z) := & \pi^{-N} \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0} \mathbb{1}_{B(0, R)}(\alpha_1, \alpha') \left| \partial_{\alpha_1} E_{-+}^\delta(\alpha_1, \alpha'; z) \right|^{-2} \\ & \cdot \left| A(\alpha, z) - \beta \frac{(\partial_z X(z) | X(z))}{\|X(z)\|^2} - B(z) \alpha_2 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4}\delta^2 h^{-7/2}) \right|^2 \\ & \cdot \exp \left\{ -\alpha' \overline{\alpha'} - \left| \frac{-\beta + E_{-+}(z) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4}\delta^2 h^{-5/2})}{\delta \|X(z)\|} \right|^2 \right\} L(d\alpha'), \end{aligned}$$

where where $\alpha_1 = \alpha_1(\beta, \alpha', z)$ and $A(\alpha, z), B(z)$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
A(\alpha, z) &:= \partial_z E_{-+}(z) - \frac{(\partial_z X(z)|X(z))}{\|X(z)\|^2} (E_{-+}(z) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4}\delta^2 h^{-5/2})) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4}\delta^2 h^{-7/2}) \\
&= (e_0|f_0)(1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4}\delta^2 h^{-7/2}) \\
(8.18) \quad &= \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{3/4}h^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\asymp\eta^{3/2}}{h}}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4}\delta^2 h^{-7/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

The second identity for A is due to Proposition 6.5 and the following estimate

$$\left| \frac{(\partial_z X(z)|X(z))}{\|X(z)\|^2} \right| \leq \frac{\|\partial_z X(z)\|}{\|X(z)\|} = (1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)) \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2}h^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2}h^{-1})$$

which follows from Propositions 5.3 and 5.4. In the last line we used Proposition 4.6 together with (3.5). Furthermore, recall by Step II and Step III that $A(\alpha, z)$ is holomorphic in α .

Similarly, we define

$$(8.19) \quad B(z) := \delta \left(\|\partial_z X(z)\|^2 - \frac{|(\partial_z X(z)|X(z))|^2}{\|X(z)\|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4}\delta h^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

The estimate in (8.19) follows from Proposition 6.1.

Remark 8.2. It follows from Proposition 6.5, Proposition 4.6, Proposition 5.4 and from (8.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta^{-\frac{n+m}{2}} h^{n+m} \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m A(z) &= \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{3/4}h^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\asymp\eta^{3/2}}{h}}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4}\delta^2 h^{-7/2}), \\
(8.20) \quad \eta^{-\frac{n+m}{2}} h^{n+m} \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m B(z) &= \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4}\delta h^{-\frac{1}{2}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $A(\beta, z)$ is continuous in β , the dominated convergence theorem shows that

$$I_1(\varphi) = \int \varphi(z) \Lambda(0, z) L(dz).$$

Next, let us look at the indicator function $\mathbb{1}_{B(0,R)}(\alpha_1(\beta, \alpha'; z), \alpha')$ for $\|\alpha'\| < R_0$: By (8.15) we have

$$|\alpha_1(0, \alpha')| = \frac{|E_{-+}(z) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2 h^{-5/2})|}{\delta \|X(z)\|}.$$

Thus, $\mathbb{1}_{B(0,R)}(\alpha_1(0, \alpha'; z), \alpha') = 1$ if $|\alpha_1(0, \alpha')|^2 \leq R^2 - R_0^2 = \frac{\tilde{C}^2}{h^2}$, $\|\alpha'\| < R_0^2$ and if $R^2 - R_0^2 < |\alpha_1(0, \alpha')|^2 < R^2$, $\|\alpha'\| < R_0^2 - |\alpha_1(0, \alpha')|^2$, and $\mathbb{1}_{B(0,R)}(\alpha_1(0, \alpha'; z), \alpha') = 0$ if $R^2 \leq |\alpha_1(0, \alpha')|^2$, with $\tilde{C}^2 := C^2 - C_0^2$. Hence, we split $\Lambda(0, z)$ into

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda(0, z) &= \Lambda(0, z) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\sqrt{\Theta(z;h,\delta)} \leq \frac{\tilde{C}}{h}\}}(z) + \mathbb{1}_{\{\frac{\tilde{C}}{h} < \sqrt{\Theta(z;h,\delta)} < R\}}(z) \right) \\
(8.21) \quad &=: \Lambda_1(0, z) + \Lambda_2(0, z),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Theta(z; h, \delta) := \frac{|E_{-+}(z) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2 \eta^{-1/4} h^{-5/2})|^2}{\delta^2 \|X(z)\|^2}.$$

We start by treating Λ_1 . Note that the function

$$\{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0\} \ni \alpha' \mapsto \exp\left\{-|\alpha_1(0, \alpha'; z)|^2\right\} \in [0, 1]$$

is continuous, bounded and recall that (8.15) holds for all $\alpha' \in \{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0\}$. Furthermore, note that all factors in the integral (8.17) are positive. Since the ball $\{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0\}$ is simply connected the intermediate value theorem yields

$$(8.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \Lambda_1(0, z) = & \pi^{-N} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sqrt{\Theta(z; h, \delta)} \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_1}{h}\}}(z) \left| \delta \|X(z)\| + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4} \delta^2 h^{-3/2}) \right|^{-2} \\ & \cdot \exp\{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)\} \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0} |A(\alpha, z) - \delta B(z) \alpha_2|^2 e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha'). \end{aligned}$$

Here we also applied (8.12). Before we can further simplify (8.22), let us consider the following technical Lemma:

Lemma 8.3. *Let $h > 0$, let $C_0, C_1 > 0$ and let $N := (2\lfloor \frac{C_1}{h} \rfloor + 1)^2$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^{N-1}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}^{N-1}$, let $R_0 = C_0/h$ and let $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^N$. If $C_0 > C_1 > 0$ are large enough and such that*

$$\ln\left(2 + \frac{eR_0^2}{N-2}\right) < \frac{R_0^2}{2(N-2)},$$

then, for $h > 0$ small enough, there exists a constant $D_{n,m} =: D > 0$ such that

$$\left| \pi^{1-N} \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} \geq R_0} \alpha'^m \overline{\alpha'}^m e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha') \right| = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}}\right).$$

Proof. Define

$$2u := \begin{cases} |n| + |m|, & \text{if it is even} \\ |n| + |m| + 1, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and notice

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \pi^{1-N} \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} \geq R_0} \alpha'^m \overline{\alpha'}^m e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha') \right| \\ & \leq \pi^{1-N} |S^{2N-3}| \int_{R_0}^{\infty} r^{2u+2N-3} e^{-r^2} dr = \frac{2}{(N-2)!} \int_{R_0^2}^{\infty} \tau^{u+N-2} e^{-\tau} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Repeated partial integration then yields

$$(8.23) \quad \frac{2}{(N-2)!} e^{-R_0^2} \sum_{i=0}^{u+N-2} \binom{u+N-2}{i} (u+N-2-i)! R_0^{2i}.$$

Using Stirling's formula one gets that (8.23) $\leq$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{e^{\sqrt{(u+N-2)}}}{(N-2)!} e^{-R_0^2} \sum_{i=0}^{u+N-2} \binom{u+N-2}{i} \left(\frac{u+N-2}{e}\right)^{u+N-2-i} R_0^{2i} \\ & \leq \frac{e^{\sqrt{(u+N-2)}}}{\sqrt{2\pi(N-2)}} e^{-R_0^2} \left(\frac{e}{N-2}\right)^{N-2} \left(R_0^2 + \frac{u+N-2}{e}\right)^{u+N-2} \\ & = e^{-R_0^2} \frac{e}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sqrt{1 + \frac{u}{N-2}} \left(\frac{R_0^2 e}{N-2} + 1 + \frac{u}{N-2}\right)^{N-2} \left(R_0^2 + \frac{u+N-2}{e}\right)^u. \end{aligned}$$

Since $u/(N-2)$ is bounded for $h > 0$ small, it remains to consider
(8.24)

$$\exp \left\{ -R_0^2 + (N-2) \ln \left(\frac{R_0^2 e}{N-2} + 1 + \frac{u}{N-2} \right) + u \ln \left(R_0^2 + \frac{u+N-2}{e} \right) \right\}.$$

However, there exists a $1 > \kappa > 0$ such that

$$-R_0^2 + (N-2) \ln \left(\frac{R_0^2 e}{N-2} + 1 + \frac{u}{N-2} \right) \leq -R_0^2 \kappa = -\frac{C_0^2}{h^2},$$

which implies that (8.24) is dominated by

$$\exp \left\{ -\frac{C_0^2}{h^2} \left(\kappa - \frac{h^2}{\mathcal{O}(1)} \ln(h) \right) \right\},$$

and we conclude the statement of the Lemma for $h > 0$ small enough. $\square$

Let us return to (8.22): We are interested in the integral

$$(8.25) \quad \pi^{-N} \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0} |A - B\alpha_2|^2 \exp \{ -\alpha' \overline{\alpha'} \} L(d\alpha').$$

We will investigate each term of (8.25) separately. Since B is constant in α and since $\int |\alpha_2|^2 \exp(-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}) L(d\alpha') = \pi^{N-1}$, we conclude, by Lemma 8.3 for $C_0 > C_1 > 0$ large enough and $h > 0$ small enough, that there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that

$$\pi^{-N} \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0} |B\alpha_2|^2 e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha') = \pi^{-1} |B|^2 + \mathcal{O} \left(\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta^2 h^{-1} e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}} \right).$$

The mean value theorem, (8.18) and Lemma 8.3 imply that there exists a constant $D > 0$ (not necessarily the same as above) such that

$$\pi^{-N} \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0} |A|^2 \exp \{ -\alpha' \overline{\alpha'} \} L(d\alpha') = \pi^{-1} |A|^2 + \mathcal{O} \left(e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}} \right).$$

Note that after the equality sign we have $A = A(\tilde{\alpha}', z)$ for an $\tilde{\alpha}' \in B(0, R_0)$ given by the mean value theorem. Next, since (8.19) is independent of α ,

$$\pi^{-N} \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0} \overline{A} B \alpha_2 e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha') = \pi^{-N} B \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0} \overline{A} \alpha_2 e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha').$$

Since $A(\alpha, z)$ is holomorphic in α we gain from (8.18) by the Cauchy inequalities

$$(8.26) \quad |\partial_{\alpha_2} A| = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4} \delta^2 h^{-5/2}).$$

Here we used that the first term in (8.18) is independent of α . Extend A to a function on $\mathbb{C}^{N-1}$ such that the above estimate still holds. Then, by Lemma 8.3 there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that

$$\pi^{-N} B \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} \geq R_0} \overline{A} \alpha_2 e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha') = \mathcal{O} \left(\eta^{1/2} h^{-1} \delta e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta^{3/2}}{h}} + \delta^3 h^{-4} \right) e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}}.$$

Here we used (8.18) and (8.19). Stokes' theorem and (8.26) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{-N} B \int_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} \overline{A} \alpha_2 e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha') &= \pi^{-N} B \int_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} (\partial_{\overline{\alpha}_2} \overline{A}) e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha') \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\delta^3 h^{-3}). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above into (8.25), we gather that there exist a constant $D > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{-N} \int_{\|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < R_0} |A - B\alpha_2|^2 \exp\{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}\} L(d\alpha') \\ = \pi^{-1} (|A(z)|^2 + |B(z)|^2) + \mathcal{O}\left(\delta^3 h^{-3} + e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}}\right) \\ =: \delta^2 \Psi(z, h, \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (8.27)$$

By (8.18) and (8.19), we see that $\pi^{-1}(|A(z)|^2 + |B(z)|^2)$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta^2}{\pi} \left((\partial_z X | \partial_z X) - \frac{1}{\|X\|^2} |(\partial_z X | X)|^2 \right. \\ \left. + \delta^{-2} |(e_0 | f_0)(1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4} \delta^2 h^{-7/2})|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The above, (8.27), (8.22) and

$$|\delta \|X(z)\| + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4} \delta^2 h^{-3/2})|^{-2} = \frac{(1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4} \delta h^{-3/2}))}{\delta^2 \pi \|X(z)\|^2},$$

imply that for $h > 0$ small enough, there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that

$$(8.28) \quad A_1(0, z) := \frac{(1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/4} \delta h^{-3/2}))}{\pi \|X(z)\|^2} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sqrt{\Theta(z; h, \delta)} \leq \frac{\tilde{C}}{h}\}}(z) \Psi(z, h, \delta) \exp^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)}.$$

Finally, let us estimate Λ_2 from (8.21): applying (8.18), (8.19) and Lemma 8.3 to (8.17) yields

$$\Lambda_2(0, z) \leq e^{-\frac{\tilde{C}}{h^2}} \mathcal{O}\left(\delta^4 \eta^{1/2} h^{-7} + \eta^{1/2} h^{-1} \delta e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta^{3/2}}{h}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}}\right),$$

for some $D > 0$. Thus, up to an error of order $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}})$, we can substitute $\mathbb{1}_{\{\sqrt{\Theta(z; h, \delta)} \leq \frac{\tilde{C}}{h}\}}(z)$ with 1 in (8.28).

Step V In this step we will estimate $I_2(\varphi)$ of (8.11). Therefore, we increase the space of integration

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\substack{B(0, R) \\ \|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} > R_0}} \chi\left(\frac{E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha)}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha)|^2 e^{-\alpha \overline{\alpha}} L(d\alpha) \\ \leq \int_{\substack{B(0, 2R) \\ R_0 < \|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < 2R_0}} \chi\left(\frac{E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha)}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} |\partial_z E_{-+}^\delta(z; \alpha)|^2 e^{-\alpha \overline{\alpha}} L(d\alpha) =: W_\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that Lemma 7.2 holds true for the set $B(0, 2R) \cap \{R_0 < \|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < 2R_0\}$, potentially by choosing a larger $C > 0$ in Proposition 1.2 larger. We can

proceed as in Step IV: perform the same change of variables and the limit of $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} W_\varepsilon = & \pi^{-N} \int_{R_0 < \|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < 2R_0} \mathbf{1}_{B(0,2R)}(\alpha_1(0, \alpha'; z), \alpha') |\partial_{\alpha_1} \beta(\alpha_1, \alpha'; z)|^{-2} \\ & \cdot |A(\alpha; z) - B(z)\alpha_2|^2 \exp \left\{ -\alpha' \overline{\alpha'} - \Lambda(z, h, \delta)^2 \right\} L(d\alpha'). \end{aligned}$$

By (8.18), (8.19) and Lemma 8.3 we see that there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi^{-N} \int_{R_0 < \|\alpha'\|_{\mathbb{C}^{N-1}} < 2R_0} |A - B\alpha_2|^2 e^{-\alpha' \overline{\alpha'}} L(d\alpha') \\ & \leq e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}} \mathcal{O} \left(\delta^4 \eta^{1/2} h^{-7} + \eta^{1/2} h^{-1} \delta e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta^{3/2}}{h}} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The statement about the derivatives of the error terms follows from (8.20) and (8.6). $\square$

9. AVERAGE DENSITY OF EIGENVALUES

First, we will give the proof the main result of this work:

Proof of Theorem 2.11. Due to (1.12) and Hypothesis 1.3 we have that, for $\kappa > 0$ (as in Definition 2.6) large enough, that (1.13) holds. Therefore, we assume that $(h \ln \frac{1}{h})^{2/3} \ll \eta \leq C$, where $C > 0$ is a constant.

In particular, we now strengthen assumption (3.1) and assume from now on that $\Omega \Subset \Sigma$ satisfies Hypothesis 1.4 if nothing else is specified, i.e. we assume that

$$\Omega \Subset \Sigma \text{ is open, relatively compact with } \text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) \gg (h \ln h^{-1})^{2/3}.$$

Recall the definition of Ω_η^a given in (3.2):

$$\Omega_\eta^a = \left\{ z \in \Omega : \frac{\eta}{C} \leq \text{Im } z \leq C\eta \right\}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Define

$$\tilde{\Omega}_\eta^a := \left\{ z \in \Omega : \frac{\eta}{2C} \leq \text{Im } z \leq 2C\eta \right\}.$$

Define $\eta_j := C^{-j}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and consider the open covering of Ω

$$\Omega \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \tilde{\Omega}_{\eta_j}^a \cup \left(\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \overline{\Omega_{\eta_j}^a} \right),$$

where $\text{dist}(\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \overline{\Omega_{\eta_j}^a}, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$, thus, conforming with the previous notation, we may define

$$\Omega_i := \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \overline{\Omega_{\eta_j}^a}.$$

Let $\{\chi_{\eta_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to this locally finite open subcovering such that

$$1 = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_{\eta_j} + \chi_{\eta_0},$$

in a neighborhood of Ω . Here, for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\chi_{\eta_j} \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}_\eta^a)$, supported in either $\tilde{\Omega}_\eta^a$. Furthermore, $\chi_{\eta_0} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_i)$. This partition of unity together with Proposition 8.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\Xi(\varphi) \mathbf{1}_{B(0,R)} \right] &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\Xi(\varphi \chi_{\eta_j}) \mathbf{1}_{B(0,R)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\Xi(\varphi \chi_0) \mathbf{1}_{B(0,R)} \right] \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int \varphi(z) \chi_{\eta_j}(z) \frac{1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{-1/4} \delta h^{-3/2})}{\pi \|X\|^2} \Psi(z; h, \delta) e^{-\Theta_j} L(dz) \\ &\quad + \int \varphi(z) \chi_0(z) \frac{1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta h^{-3/2})}{\pi \|X\|^2} \Psi(z; h, \delta) e^{-\Theta_0} L(dz) + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Theta_j := \frac{\left| E_{-+}(z) + \mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{-1/4} \delta^2 h^{-5/2}) \right|^2}{\delta^2 \|X\|^2}, \quad \Theta_0 := \frac{\left| E_{-+}(z) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2 h^{-5/2}) \right|^2}{\delta^2 \|X\|^2}.$$

Note that to gain the exponentially small error estimate in the above we used that the bound on the distribution $T_h \in D'(\mathbb{C})$ (cf. Proposition 8.1) is independent of η . Thus,

$$\left| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle T_h, \varphi \chi_{\eta_j} \rangle \right| = |\langle T_h, \varphi \rangle| \leq C \|\varphi\|_\infty e^{-\frac{D}{h^2}}.$$

Analysis of the density Ψ Recall the formula for the density of eigenvalues given in Proposition 8.1. Define

$$(9.1) \quad \Psi_1(z; h, \delta) := (\partial_z X | \partial_z X) - \frac{1}{\|X\|^2} |(\partial_z X | X)|^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3 h^{-3})$$

Since the error above is of order $\mathcal{O}(1)$, it follows from Proposition 6.1 that

$$\Psi_1(z, h, \delta) = \frac{1}{h} \left\{ \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+(z))} - \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_-(z))} \right\} + \mathcal{O}(\text{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma)^{-2}),$$

where we used that $\text{Im } z \asymp \eta_j$ for $z \in \Omega_{\eta_j}^a$. Proposition 6.2 implies

$$\Psi_1(z, h, \delta) L(dz) = \frac{1}{2h} p_*(d\xi \wedge dx) + \mathcal{O}(\text{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma)^{-2}) L(dz).$$

Furthermore, Proposition 8.1 and Proposition 6.1 yield that

$$\eta^{-\frac{n+m}{2}} h^{n+m} \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m \mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{-2}) = \mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{-2}),$$

where $\mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{-2})$ is the error term of Ψ_1 . Next, let us turn to the second part of Ψ :

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta^{-2} \left| (e_0 | f_0) (1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)) + \mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{1/4} \delta^2 h^{-7/2}) \right|^2 \\ &= \delta^{-2} |(e_0 | f_0)|^2 (1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)) + \mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{1/2} \delta^2 h^{-7}) + \mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{1/4} h^{-7/2} |(e_0 | f_0)|) \\ &= \delta^{-2} |(e_0 | f_0)|^2 (1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)) + \mathcal{O}(\eta_j h^{-4} e^{-\frac{\delta}{h}} + \eta_j^{1/2} \delta^2 h^{-7}). \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we applied an estimate on $|(e_0 | f_0)|$ which follows from Proposition 4.2. The error term $\mathcal{O}(\eta_j h^{-4} e^{-\frac{\delta}{h}})$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\eta_j)$ because $\eta \gg (-h \ln h)^{2/3}$.

We then absorb $\mathcal{O}(\eta_j)$ into the error term $\mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{-2})$ of Ψ_1 as well as the error term $\mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{1/2}\delta^2h^{-7}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{1/2})$. Then, one defines

$$(9.2) \quad \Psi_2(z; h, \delta) := \frac{|(e_0|f_0)|^2}{\delta^2} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{-3/4}h^{1/2}\right) \right).$$

As in (8.20), the error estimates don't change if we apply $\eta^{-\frac{n+m}{2}}h^{n+m}\partial_z^n\partial_{\bar{z}}^m$.

Analysis of the exponential Θ Recall from Proposition 4.1 that $-\alpha_0 = E_{-+}$ and use (4.26) to find that

$$E_{-+}(z) = ([P_h, \chi]e_0|f_0) \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left[-\frac{\eta_j^{3/2}}{h}\right]\right) \right).$$

Here $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(S^1)$ with $\chi \equiv 1$ in a small open neighborhood of $\overline{\{x_-(z); z \in \Omega\}}$. Thus, using $\|X\| = (1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty))$ (cf. Proposition 5.3), we have the following equation for Θ given in Proposition 8.1

$$(9.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \Theta(z, h, \delta) &= \frac{\left| E_{-+}(z) + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{-1/4}\delta^2h^{-5/2}\right) \right|^2}{\delta^2\|X\|^2} \\ &= \frac{\left| ([P_h, \chi]e_0|f_0) + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{-1/4}\delta^2h^{-5/2}\right) \right|^2}{\delta^2(1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty))} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\eta_j^{3/2}}{h}}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

As in (8.20), the error estimates stay invariant under the action of $\eta_j^{-\frac{n+m}{2}}h^{n+m}\partial_z^n\partial_{\bar{z}}^m$. Finally, to conclude the density given in the Theorem, note that

$$\frac{1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{-1/4}\delta h^{-3/2}\right)}{\pi\|X\|^2} = \frac{1 + \mathcal{O}(\text{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma)^{-1/4}\delta h^{-3/2})}{\pi}. \quad \square$$

In the case of the operator P_h^δ , it is possible to state more explicit formulas for the different parts of the density of eigenvalues given in Theorem 2.11:

It follows by Propositions 6.1 and 6.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2h}p_*(d\xi \wedge dx) &= \frac{1}{h} \left\{ \frac{i}{\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+(z))} + \frac{i}{\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-(z))} \right\} L(dz) \\ &\asymp \frac{1}{h\sqrt{\text{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma)}} L(dz) \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\text{Im } z \asymp \eta_j$ for $z \in \Omega_\eta^a$. For our purposes we can assume that $|\text{Im } z - \langle \text{Im } g \rangle| > 1/C$, $C \gg 1$, since inside this tube Ψ_2 and Θ are exponentially small in $h > 0$. In the case of Ψ_2 , this follows from the assumptions on δ (cf. Definition 2.6) and from Remark 4.4. In the case of Θ , this follows from the assumptions on δ and Proposition 4.12 and (9.3). Thus, applying Proposition 4.2 to (9.2) yields

$$(9.4) \quad \Psi_2(z; h, \delta) = \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi h \delta^2 \exp\left\{\frac{2S}{h}\right\}} |\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)|^2 \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3/4}h^{1/2}) \right).$$

As in (8.20), the error estimates don't change if we apply $\eta^{-\frac{n+m}{2}} h^{n+m} \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m$. Moreover, since $\text{Im } z \asymp \eta_j$ for $z \in \Omega_\eta^\alpha$,

$$\Psi_2^0(z; h, \delta) \asymp \frac{(\text{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma))^{3/2} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{h\delta^2}.$$

Apply Proposition 4.12 to (9.3) gives that

$$(9.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \Theta(z, h, \delta) = & V(z, h)^2 \frac{e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\delta^2} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta_j^{3/2}}{h}}\right) \right) \\ & + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{-1/2} \delta^2 h^{-5}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(V h^{-5/2} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 \leq V = \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{1/4} h^{1/2}\right)$ by (4.23), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(z, h, \delta) = & \frac{h \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\pi \delta^2} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{-1/4} h^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) \right) \\ & + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{-1/2} \delta^2 h^{-5}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{1/4} h^{-2} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for $e^{-\frac{2S}{h}} \delta^{-2} \leq 1$, the error term $\mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{1/4} h^{-2} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right)$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\eta_j^{1/4} h^{-2} \delta)$ since there we have that $e^{-\frac{S}{h}} \leq \delta$. For $e^{-\frac{2S}{h}} \delta^{-2} \leq 1$, we have that

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{1/4} h^{-2} e^{-\frac{S}{h}}\right) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{1/4} h^{-2} \delta e^{-\frac{2S}{h}} \delta^{-2}\right) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{1/4} h^2 e^{-\frac{2S}{h}} \delta^{-2}\right).$$

Thus,

$$(9.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \Theta(z, h, \delta) = & \frac{h \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\pi \delta^2} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{-1/4} h^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) \right) \\ & + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta_j^{1/4} h^{-2} \delta + \eta_j^{-1/2} \delta^2 h^{-5}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Analogous to (8.20), the error estimates stay invariant under the action of $\eta_j^{-\frac{n+m}{2}} h^{n+m} \partial_z^n \partial_{\bar{z}}^m$. Moreover,

$$\Theta^0(z; h, \delta) \asymp h \sqrt{\text{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma)} \frac{e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\delta^2}.$$

We have thus proven Proposition 2.13 and Proposition 2.12. Since we will need it later on we will state the following formulas:

Lemma 9.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.11 and for $(h \ln h^{-1})^{2/3} \ll \eta < \text{const.}$ we have*

$$\partial_{\text{Im } z} \Psi_1 = -\frac{1}{4h} \left(\frac{\text{Im } g''(x_-)}{(\text{Im } g'(x_-))^3} - \frac{\text{Im } g''(x_+)}{(\text{Im } g'(x_+))^3} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2}) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3/2} h^{-1})$$

and for $|\text{Im } z - \langle \text{Im } g \rangle| > 1/C$, $C > 0$ large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{Im } z} \Psi_2(z, h) = & \frac{2 \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi h^2} |\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)|^2 (-\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)) \frac{e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\delta^2} \\ & \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-3/4} h^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\text{Im } z}\Theta(z, h) &= \frac{2 \left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi \delta^2 \exp\left\{-\frac{2S}{h}\right\}} (-\partial_{\text{Im } z}S(z)) \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-1/4}h^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{3/4}h^{-3}\delta + \delta^2h^{-6}\right),\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us first treat Ψ_1 : Recall from the proof of Proposition 6.5 that Ψ_1 was given by an oscillatory integral where the phase vanishes at the critical point. Thus, the $\partial_{\text{Im } z}$ derivative of the error term $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2})$ grows at most by η^{-1} . Thus, taking the derivative of (9.1) yields

$$\partial_{\text{Im } z}\Psi_1 = -\frac{1}{4h} \left(\frac{\text{Im } g''(x_-)}{(\text{Im } g'(x_-))^3} - \frac{\text{Im } g''(x_+)}{(\text{Im } g'(x_+))^3} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3}) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3/2}h^{-1}),$$

where the last estimate follows from $|2\text{Im } g'(x_{\pm})| = |\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_{\pm})| \asymp \sqrt{\eta}$ (cf. Proposition 6.1) and from the fact that the z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivative of the error term grow at most by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2}h^{-1})$.

Now let us turn to Ψ_2 : one calculates from (9.4) that for $|\text{Im } z - \langle \text{Im } g \rangle| > 1/C$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\text{Im } z}\Psi_2(z, h) &= \frac{2 \left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi h^2} |\partial_{\text{Im } z}S(z)|^2 (-\partial_{\text{Im } z}S(z)) \frac{e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\delta^2} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-3/4}h^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Here we used that the z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivative of the error terms grow at most by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2}h^{-1})$.

Finally, let us turn to Θ : as in the proof of Proposition 4.3 one calculates the formula for $\partial_{\text{Im } z}\Theta$ from (9.6). $\square$

10. PROPERTIES OF THE DENSITY

In this section we will discuss and prove the results stated in Section 2.4.

10.1. Local maximum of the average density. First, we prove the resolvent estimate given in Proposition 2.5.

Proof of Proposition 2.5. Recall that the operator $Q(z)$ is self-adjoint and that $|t_0(z)| = |\alpha_0(z)|$; see Section 2.2. It follows that

$$\|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| = |t_0(z)|^{-1} = |\alpha_0(z)|^{-1}.$$

Recall the Grushin problem posed in Proposition 4.1. Since $E_{-+}^{-1} = -\alpha_0$, it follows by Proposition 4.12 that

$$(10.1) \quad \|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| = \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{S}{h}\right\}}{V(z)|1 - e^{\Phi(z)}| \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta^{\frac{3}{2}}}{h}}\right)\right)},$$

which together with (4.23) implies (2.3). The result about the asymptotic behavior of the resolvent follows from the above together with the fact that $|\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_{\pm})| \asymp \sqrt{\eta}$ (cf. Proposition 6.1). $\square$

We have split the proof of Proposition 2.14 into the following two Lemmata:

Lemma 10.1. *Let $z \in \Omega \subseteq \Sigma_{c,d}$ with $\Sigma_{c,d}$ as in (2.15), let $S(z)$ be as in Definition 2.2. Let $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon(h)$ be as in Definition 2.6 with $\kappa > 0$ large enough. Moreover, let $E_{-+}(z)$ be as in Proposition 4.1. Then,*

- *for $0 < h \ll 1$, there exist numbers $y_{\pm}(h)$ such that $\varepsilon_0 = S(y_{\pm}(h))$ with*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{C}(h \ln h^{-1})^{\frac{2}{3}} &\ll y_{-}(h) < \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle - ch \ln h^{-1} \\ &< \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle + ch \ln h^{-1} < y_{+}(h) \ll \operatorname{Im} g(b) - \frac{1}{C}(h \ln h^{-1})^{\frac{2}{3}}, \end{aligned}$$

for $c > 1$. Furthermore,

$$y_{-}(h), (\operatorname{Im} g(b) - y_{+}(h)) \asymp (\varepsilon_0(h))^{2/3};$$

- *there exists $h_0 > 0$ and a family of smooth curves, indexed by $h \in]h_0, 0[$,*

$$\gamma_{\pm}^h :]c, d[\longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \text{ with } \operatorname{Re} \gamma_{\pm}^h(t) = t$$

such that

$$|E_{-+}(\gamma_{\pm}^h(t))| = \delta,$$

and

$$\operatorname{Im} \gamma_{\pm}^h(t) = y_{\pm}(\varepsilon_0(h)) \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{h}{\varepsilon_0(h)} \right) \right).$$

Furthermore, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d \operatorname{Im} \gamma_{\pm}^h}{dt}(t) = \mathcal{O} \left(\exp \left[-\frac{\varepsilon_0(h)}{Ch} \right] \right).$$

Lemma 10.2. *Assume the same hypothesis as in Lemma 10.1 and let*

$$D(z, h) := \frac{1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\delta h^{-\frac{3}{2}} \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial \Sigma)^{-1/4} \right)}{\pi} \Psi(z; h, \delta) \exp \{ -\Theta(z; h, \delta) \}$$

be the average density of eigenvalues of the operator of P_h^{δ} given in Theorem 2.11. Then, there exists $h_0 > 0$ and a family of smooth curves, indexed by $h \in]h_0, 0[$,

$$\Gamma_{\pm}^h :]c, d[\longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \operatorname{Re} \Gamma_{\pm}^h(t) = t,$$

with $\Gamma_{-} \subset \{ \operatorname{Im} z < \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle \}$ and $\Gamma_{+} \subset \{ \operatorname{Im} z > \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle \}$, along which $\operatorname{Im} z \mapsto D(z, h)$ takes its local maxima on the vertical line $\operatorname{Re} z = \operatorname{const.}$ and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \operatorname{Im} \Gamma_{\pm}^h(t) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{h^4}{\varepsilon_0(h)^4} \right).$$

Moreover, for all $c < t < d$

$$|\Gamma_{\pm}^h(t) - \gamma_{\pm}^h(t)| \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{h^5}{\varepsilon_0(h)^{13/3}} \right).$$

Proof of Proposition 2.14. The first two points of the proposition follow from Lemma 10.1 together with the observations that $|E_{-+}(z)| = |\alpha_0| = |t_0(z)|$ (cf. Proposition 4.1) and that by (10.1)

$$\|(P_h - \gamma_{\pm}^h)^{-1}\| = \delta^{-1}.$$

The third point has been proven with Lemma 10.2. □

Proof of Lemma 10.1. Recall from Proposition 2.3 that S is strictly monotonous above and below the spectral line, i.e. $\text{Im } z = \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$. Furthermore, recall from Definition 2.6 that $-(\kappa - \frac{1}{2})h \ln h + Ch \leq \varepsilon_0(h) < S(\langle \text{Im } g \rangle)$. Thus, the implicit function theorem implies that there exist $y_{\pm}(\varepsilon_0(h)) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $S(y_{\pm}(\varepsilon_0(h))) = \varepsilon_0(h)$. Note that in the case where $\varepsilon_0(h)$ is independent of h , the same holds true for $y_{\pm}(\varepsilon_0)$. For the rest of the proof we will only treat the case where $\text{Im } z \leq \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$ (corresponding to y_-) since the other case is similar.

Consider $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma_{c,d}$ with $\text{Re } z = \text{const}$. First, let us prove some a priori estimates: assume that there exists a ζ_- with $h^{2/3} \ll \zeta_- \leq \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$ such that $|E_{-+}(\text{Re } z + i\zeta_-)|\delta^{-1} = 1$. Recall Proposition 2.3 and note that

$$\begin{aligned} S(z) - \varepsilon_0(h) &= \int_{\langle \text{Im } g \rangle}^{\text{Im } z} (\partial_{\text{Im } z} S)(t) dt + S(\langle \text{Im } g \rangle) - \varepsilon_0(h) \\ (10.2) \quad &= \int_{y_-(\varepsilon_0(h))}^{\text{Im } z} (\partial_{\text{Im } z} S)(t) dt + S(y_-(\varepsilon_0(h))) - \varepsilon_0(h). \end{aligned}$$

Recall Proposition 4.12 and Definition 2.6. It follows by (10.2), that if $|\zeta_- - \langle \text{Im } g \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{C}$, $C > 0$ large enough, then $|E_{-+}(\text{Re } z + i\zeta_-)|\delta^{-1} \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{1/4} e^{-\frac{1}{Dh}}\right)$ for some $D > 0$ large. Thus, we may assume that, in case it exists,

$$(10.3) \quad |\zeta_- - \langle \text{Im } g \rangle| > \frac{1}{C}.$$

We conclude from (10.2) that

$$(10.4) \quad y_-(h) \asymp (\varepsilon_0(h))^{2/3}$$

and that for $C > 0$ large enough

$$(10.5) \quad |\langle \text{Im } g \rangle - y_-(\varepsilon)| > \frac{1}{C}.$$

(10.4), (10.5) and Definition 2.6 imply, for $\kappa > 0$ large enough, the first point of the Lemma.

Now let us prove the existence of the points ζ_- . More precisely, we will prove that for $z \in \Omega \Subset \Sigma_{c,d}$ with $\text{Im } z < \langle \text{Im } g \rangle - 1/C$ (cf. (10.3)) and fixed $\text{Re } z$ there exist exactly one ζ_- such that $|E_{-+}(\text{Re } z, \zeta_-)|\delta^{-1} = 1$. For $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_{\eta}^a \Subset \Sigma_{c,d}$ one calculates from by Proposition 4.12 that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{Im } z} |E_{-+}(z)| &= \left\{ -V(z) \frac{\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)}{h} |1 - e^{\Phi(z)}| \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta^{\frac{3}{2}}}{h}}\right) \right) \right. \\ (10.6) \quad &\left. + \partial_{\text{Im } z} \left[V(z) |1 - e^{\Phi(z)}| \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\asymp \eta^{\frac{3}{2}}}{h}}\right) \right) \right] \right\} e^{-\frac{S(z)}{h}}, \end{aligned}$$

Recall that V is the product of the normalization factors of the quasimodes e_{wkb} and f_{wkb} when $z \in \Omega$ with $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$ and the product of the normalization factors of the quasimodes e_{wkb}^{η} and f_{wkb}^{η} when $z \in \Omega \cap \Omega_{\eta}^a$ (cf. (4.21)). Since the derivative with respect to $\text{Im } z$ of the imaginary part of their phase function $\text{Im } \phi_{\pm}$ is equal to zero at $x_{\pm}$, it follows that

$$(10.7) \quad |\partial_{\text{Im } z} V(z)| = \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2} \eta^{-3/4}).$$

The a priori bound (10.3) implies that there exists a constant $C > 1$ such that

$$(10.8) \quad |1 - e^{\Phi(z)}| = 1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right), \text{ and } \partial_{\text{Im } z}|1 - e^{\Phi(z)}| = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right).$$

The fact that $\partial_{\text{Im } z}S(z) > 0$ (cf. (2.3)) implies that $\partial_{\text{Im } z}|E_{-+}(z)| < 0$. Note that in the case where $\text{dist}(\Omega, \partial\Sigma) > 1/C$ one sets in the above $\eta = 1$. Recall from Propositions 4.9 and 4.10 that V is independent of $\text{Re } z$. Using

$$\partial_{\text{Re } z}|1 - e^{\Phi(z)}| = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}\right),$$

we conclude that

$$(10.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{Re } z}|E_{-+}(z)| &= \partial_{\text{Re } z} \left[V(z)|1 - e^{\Phi(z)}| \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\frac{3}{2}\eta}{h}}\right) \right) \right] e^{-\frac{S(z)}{h}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\frac{3}{2}\eta}{h}}\right) e^{-\frac{S(z)}{h}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the gradient $|E_{-+}(z)|$ is non-zero for all z with $|\text{Im } z - \langle \text{Im } g \rangle| > 1/C$ (cf. (10.3)) and thus we may conclude by the implicit function theorem, that for δ as above there exist locally smooth curves $\gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z) := (\text{Re } z, \zeta_-(\varepsilon_0(h), \text{Re } z))$ such that $|E_{-+}(\gamma_-^h)| = \delta$. Furthermore, we may extend $\gamma_-(\text{Re } z)$ smoothly for $c < \text{Re } z < d$. By the mean value theorem applied to $|E_{-+}(z)|$, there exists a ζ between $y_-(h)$ and $\text{Im } \gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &||E_{-+}(\text{Re } z + iy_-(h))| - |E_{-+}(\gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z))|| \\ &= |(\partial_{\text{Im } z}|E_{-+}(z)|)(\text{Re } z + i\zeta)| \cdot |y_-(h) - \text{Im } \gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|E_{-+}| = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h}\eta^{1/4}e^{-\frac{S}{h}})$ (cf. Proposition 4.6) and since $\partial_{\text{Im } z}|E_{-+}| \asymp -h^{-1/2}\eta^{3/4}e^{-\frac{S}{h}}$ (cf. (10.6)), it follows that

$$|y_-(h) - \text{Im } \gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z)| = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/2}h).$$

$\eta \asymp y_-(h) \asymp (\varepsilon_0(h))^{2/3}$ implies that also $\text{Im } \gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z) \asymp \eta \asymp (\varepsilon_0(h))^{2/3}$, and we conclude that

$$\text{Im } \gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z) = y_-(\varepsilon_0(h)) \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{h}{\varepsilon_0(h)}\right) \right).$$

Finally, by

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{d\text{Re } z}|E_{-+}(\gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z))| \\ &= \partial_{\text{Re } z}|E_{-+}(\gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z))| + \partial_{\text{Im } z}|E_{-+}(\gamma_-^h(\text{Re } z))| \frac{d\text{Im } \gamma_-^h}{d\text{Re } z}(\text{Re } z). \end{aligned}$$

and by (10.6) and (10.9) we may then conclude

$$(10.10) \quad \frac{d\text{Im } \gamma_-^h}{d\text{Re } z}(\text{Re } z) = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{\frac{3}{2}\eta}{h}}\right)$$

which, using $\eta \asymp y_-(h) \asymp (\varepsilon_0(h))^{2/3}$, yields the last statement of the Lemma. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 10.2. The idea of this proof is to search for the critical points of the average density of eigenvalues via the Banach fix point theorem. We shall only consider the case where $\text{Im } z \leq \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$ since the other case is similar.

Recall from Proposition 2.12 the explicit form the density given in Theorem 2.11. Proposition 6.1 and the fact that $\text{Im } g$ has exactly two critical points imply that Ψ_1 is strictly monotonously decreasing. Thus, we may assume similar to (10.3) that for $C > 0$ large enough

$$(10.11) \quad |\text{Im } z - \langle \text{Im } g \rangle| > \frac{1}{C}.$$

since else $\Psi_2 = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{1}{Dh}})$ with $D > 0$ large. Now, to find the critical points of the density of eigenvalues consider

$$(10.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \pi \partial_{\text{Im } z} D(z, h) &= (\partial_{\text{Im } z} \Psi(z; h, \delta) \exp\{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)\}) (1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta \eta^{-1/4} h^{-3/2})) \\ &\quad + \Psi(z; h, \delta) \exp\{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)\} \mathcal{O}(\delta \eta^{1/4} h^{-5/2}) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that the z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivative of the error term $\mathcal{O}(\delta \eta^{-1/4} h^{-3/2})$ increases its order of growth at most by a term of order $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2} h^{-1})$ (cf. Theorem 2.11). By

$$\partial_{\text{Im } z} \Psi(z; h, \delta) e^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)} = (\partial_{\text{Im } z} \Psi_1 + \partial_{\text{Im } z} \Psi_2 - (\Psi_1 + \Psi_2) \partial_{\text{Im } z} \Theta) e^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)},$$

and by Lemma 9.1 and Proposition 2.12, we can write (10.12) as

$$(10.13) \quad \begin{aligned} &h^{-3} F(z, h, \delta) + 2 \frac{e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\delta^2} |\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)|^2 (-\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)) \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi h^2} \\ &\cdot (1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3/4} h^{1/2})) \left((1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3/2} h)) - \frac{h \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi \delta^2 \exp\{-\frac{2S}{h}\}} \right) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $F(z, h, \delta)$ is a function depending smoothly on z , satisfying the bound

$$F(z, h, \delta) \asymp -\frac{h^2}{\eta^{3/2}}.$$

Here we used $\partial_{\text{Im } z} \Psi_1 \asymp -(\eta^{3/2} h)^{-1}$ which follows from Lemma 9.1 using the fact that $\text{Im } g$ has only two critical points: a minimum at a and a maximum at b .

Remark 10.3. In the case $\text{Im } z > \langle \text{Im } g \rangle$ we find similarly that $F(z, h, \delta) \asymp \frac{h^2}{\eta^{3/2}}$.

Furthermore, the functions in (10.13) are smooth in z and the z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivate increase their order of growth at most by $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2} h^{-1})$. Recall $|E_- + (z)|$ as given in Proposition 4.12 and define

$$l(z) := |E_{-+}(z)| = \frac{h \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\pi \delta^2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3/2} h))$$

Thus, (10.13) is equal to zero if and only if

$$(10.14) \quad G(z, h, \delta) + l(1 - l) = 0,$$

where $G(z, h, \delta)$ is a function depending smoothly on z , satisfying

$$G(z, h, \delta) = \frac{F(z, h, \delta)}{2 |\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z)|^2 (-\partial_{\text{Im } z} S(z))} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3/4} h^{1/2})) \asymp \frac{h^2}{\eta^3}.$$

The z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivate increase the order of growth of G at most by $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1})$. For $l \geq 0$ to be a solution to (10.14), it is necessary that

$$l = 1 + \frac{h^2}{\mathcal{O}(1)\eta^3}.$$

Thus, $l \asymp 1$. Define the smooth function

$$z \mapsto t(z) := \frac{\eta^3}{h^2}(l(z) - 1),$$

with $-c_0 \leq t \leq C_0$ and $c_0, C_0 > 0$ large enough. As in (10.6) one calculates

$$\frac{h^2}{\eta^3} \partial_{\text{Im } z} t = -\frac{2\partial_{\text{Im } z} S}{h} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3/2}h)) l(\text{Im } z) \asymp -\frac{\eta^{1/2}}{h},$$

where we used that $\partial_{\text{Im } z} S \asymp \sqrt{\eta}$ (cf. Proposition 2.3) and that the $\partial_{\text{Im } z}$ derivative of $(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/2})$ due to the scaling $\tilde{z} = z\eta$ as in the proof of Proposition 3.11. The implicit function theorem then implies that we may locally invert and that $t \mapsto (\text{Im } z)(t)$ is smooth. Since $-c_0 \leq t \leq C_0$ we may continue $(\text{Im } z)(t)$ smoothly to all open subsets of the domain of t . Furthermore, we conclude that

$$(10.15) \quad \frac{d(\text{Im } z)}{dt} \asymp -\eta^{-7/2}h^3$$

Substitute $\text{Im } z = \text{Im } z(t)$ in (10.14). To find the critical points, it is then enough to consider

$$t - \tilde{G}(t, \text{Re } z, h, \delta) = 0, \quad \tilde{G}(t, \text{Re } z, h, \delta) := \frac{G(\text{Im } z(t), \text{Re } z, h, \delta)}{\eta^{-3}h^2(1 + \eta^{-3}h^2t)}$$

and one finds

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{G}(t, \text{Re } z, h, \delta) = \mathcal{O}(h^2\eta^{-3}).$$

Thus, using $t(\gamma_-^h) = 0$ as starting point, which corresponds to $l(\gamma_-^h) = 1$, the Banach fixed-point theorem implies that for each $\text{Re } z$ there exist a unique zero, $t_-^*(\text{Re } z)$, of (10.13), it depends smoothly on $\text{Re } z$ and satisfies

$$(10.16) \quad |t_-^*(\text{Re } z) - t(\gamma_-^h)| \leq \mathcal{O}(h^2\eta^{-3}).$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dt_-^*(\text{Re } z)}{d\text{Re } z} &= \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{G}\right)(t_-^*, \text{Re } z, h, \delta)} (\partial_{\text{Re } z} \tilde{G})(t_-^*, \text{Re } z, h, \delta) \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \mathcal{O}(h^2\eta^{-3})} (\partial_{\text{Re } z} \tilde{G})(t_-^*, \text{Re } z, h, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Since the z - and $\bar{z}$ -derivate applied to G increase its order of growth at most by $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2}h^{-1})$, we conclude that

$$\frac{dt_-^*(\text{Re } z)}{d\text{Re } z} = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/2}h^{-1}).$$

Taylor's formula applied to $(\text{Im } z)(t)$ yields that

$$(\text{Im } z)(t_{\pm}^*(\text{Re } z)) = \text{Im } z(t(\text{Im } \gamma_{\pm}^h(\text{Re } z))) + \int_{t(\text{Im } \gamma_{\pm}^h(\text{Re } z))}^{t_{\pm}^*(\text{Re } z)} \frac{d\text{Im } z}{dt}(\tau) d\tau.$$

By (10.16) and (10.15) we conclude that

$$(10.17) \quad (\operatorname{Im} z)(t_{\pm}^*(\operatorname{Re} z)) = \operatorname{Im} \gamma_{\pm}^h(\operatorname{Re} z) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-13/2}h^5)$$

and using (10.10) that

$$\frac{d}{d\operatorname{Re} z}(\operatorname{Im} z)(t_{\pm}^*(\operatorname{Re} z)) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-6}h^4).$$

It follows by Proposition 2.16 that the density has local maxima along the curves $\Gamma_{\pm}^h(\operatorname{Re} z) := (\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Im} z(t_{\pm}^*(\operatorname{Re} z)))$. Applying this definition to (10.17) yields that

$$|\operatorname{Im} \Gamma_{\pm}^h(\operatorname{Re} z) - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_{\pm}^h(\operatorname{Re} z)| \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-13/2}h^5)$$

for all $z \in \Sigma_{c,d}$. By Lemma 10.1 we have that $\operatorname{Im} \gamma_{\pm}^h(\operatorname{Re} z) \asymp \varepsilon_0(h)^{2/3}$. Thus,

$$\operatorname{Im} \Gamma_{\pm}^h(\operatorname{Re} z) = \operatorname{Im} \gamma_{\pm}^h(\operatorname{Re} z) (1 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_0(h)^{-5}h^5)),$$

which in particular implies that $\operatorname{Im} \Gamma_{\pm}^h(\operatorname{Re} z) \asymp \varepsilon_0(h)^{2/3}$. This concludes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2.16. Proposition 2.12 implies that for $|\operatorname{Im} z - \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle| > 1/C$

$$(10.18) \quad \Psi_2(z, h, \delta) = \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi h \delta^2 \exp\{\frac{2S}{h}\}} |\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S(z)|^2 (1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-3/4}h^{1/2}))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(z; h, \delta) &= \frac{h \left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\pi \delta^2} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-1/4}h^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4}h^{-2}\delta + \eta^{-1/2}\delta^2h^{-5}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, one calculates

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Psi_2 - \frac{|\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S|^2}{h^2} \Theta \right| &\leq \frac{\left(\frac{i}{2}\{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2}\{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi h \delta^2} e^{-\frac{2S}{h}} |\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S(z)|^2 \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{-\frac{3}{4}}h^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{5/4}h^{-4}\delta + \eta^{1/2}\delta^2h^{-7}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the result given in Proposition 2.5. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2.15. We will only consider the case $z \in \Sigma_{c,d}$ with $\operatorname{Im} z \leq \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle$.

A priori restrictions on the domain of integration Let $y_-(h)$ and $\gamma_-(\operatorname{Re} z)$ be as in Lemma 10.1 and note that similarly to (10.2), we have

$$(10.19) \quad S(\operatorname{Im} z) - \varepsilon_0(h) = \int_{y_-(h)}^{\operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h} (\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S)(t) dt + \int_{\operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h}^{\operatorname{Im} z} (\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S)(t) dt.$$

Recall from Lemma 10.1 that $(\operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h - y_-(h)) \asymp h\varepsilon_0^{-1/3}$. Then, one calculates using the mean value theorem and Proposition 2.3, similar as in the proof of Lemma 10.1 (cf. (10.4)) that

$$\int_{y_-(h)}^{\operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h} (\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S)(t) dt = \mathcal{O}(h)$$

and that

$$\int_{\operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h}^{\operatorname{Im} z} (\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S)(t) dt \asymp (\operatorname{Im} z - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h) \eta^{1/2},$$

where η should be set to 1 in case of $\operatorname{dist}(z, \partial \Sigma_{c,d}) > 1/C$. Next, (10.19) and Proposition 2.12 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(z; h, \delta) &= \frac{\eta^{1/2}}{\mathcal{O}(1)} \exp \left\{ - \asymp \frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h) \eta^{1/2}}{h} \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4} h^{-2} \delta + \eta^{-1/2} \delta^2 h^{-5}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used that $\delta = \sqrt{h} \exp\{-\frac{\varepsilon_0(h)}{h}\}$; see Definition 2.6. Thus, for $\operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h < \operatorname{Im} z < \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle$

(10.20)

$$\exp\{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)\} = \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\eta^{1/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h) \eta^{1/2}}{Ch}\right\} + \eta^{1/4} h^2\right) \right)$$

and for $\operatorname{Im} z \leq \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h$

$$\begin{aligned} (10.21) \quad \frac{1}{C} \exp \left\{ -C \eta^{1/2} \exp \left[-\frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h) \eta^{1/2}}{Ch} \right] \right\} &\leq \exp\{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)\} \\ &\leq C \exp \left\{ -\frac{\eta^{1/2}}{C} \exp \left[-\frac{C(\operatorname{Im} z - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h) \eta^{1/2}}{h} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Proposition 2.12

$$\Psi_2(z; h, \delta) \leq \frac{\eta^{3/2}}{\mathcal{O}(1) h^2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1}) e^{\Phi(z,h)}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h) \eta^{1/2}}{Ch} \right\}.$$

Thus, for $\operatorname{Im} \gamma_- (\operatorname{Re} z) + \alpha h \eta^{-1/2} \ln \frac{\eta^{1/2}}{h} \leq \operatorname{Im} z \leq \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle$ with $\alpha > 0$ large enough, we see that the average density of eigenvalues (cf. Theorem 2.11)

$$(10.22) \quad D(z, h, \delta) L(dz) = \frac{1}{2h} p_*(d\xi \wedge dx) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2}) L(dz).$$

We then conclude the first statement of the proposition.

Next, recall from Proposition 1.2 that restricting the probability space to the ball $B(0, R)$ of radius $R = Ch^{-1}$ implies that $\|Q_\omega\| \leq C/h$ with probability $\geq (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{Ch^2}})$. It follows from

$$\|(P_h^\delta - z)^{-1}\| = \left\| (P_h - z)^{-1} \sum_{n \geq 1} (-\delta)^n (Q_\omega(P_h - z)^{-1})^n \right\|$$

that for $z \notin \sigma(P_h)$ such that $\delta \|Q_\omega\| \|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| < 1$ $z \notin \sigma(P_h^\delta)$ with probability $\geq (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{Ch^2}})$. Proposition 2.5 implies that with probability $\geq (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{Ch^2}})$

$$\delta \|Q_\omega\| \|(P_h - z)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{C |1 - e^{\Phi(z,h)}|^{-1}}{h^{3/2} \left(\frac{i}{2} \{p, \bar{p}\}(\rho_+) \frac{i}{2} \{\bar{p}, p\}(\rho_-) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}} \exp \left\{ \frac{S(z) - \varepsilon_0(h)}{h} \right\}.$$

Since $S(z) \asymp \eta^{3/2}$, it follows that $\eta \asymp \varepsilon_0(h)^{2/3}$. Using the mean value theorem together with Lemma 10.1 implies that with probability $\geq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{Ch^2}}\right)$ there are no eigenvalues of P_h^δ with

$$\operatorname{Im} z \leq \beta_1 := \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h - C \frac{h}{\varepsilon_0(h)^{1/3}} \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0(h)^{1/6}}{h} \right), \quad C \gg 1.$$

Thus, to count eigenvalues, it is sufficient to integrate the density given in Theorem 2.11 over subsets of

$$\Sigma'_{c,d} = \{z \in \Sigma_{c,d} \mid \beta_1 \leq \operatorname{Im} z \leq \langle \operatorname{Im} g \rangle, \quad c < \operatorname{Re} z < d\}.$$

Similarly, for an α large enough as above, define

$$\alpha_1 := \operatorname{Im} \gamma_- (\operatorname{Re} z) + \alpha \frac{h}{\varepsilon_0^{1/3}} \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0(h)^{1/3}}{h}$$

and note that (10.22) implies the second statement of the proposition for $\operatorname{Im} z \geq \alpha_1$.

Approximate Primitive Define $d(z) := \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\Sigma)$ and recall from (3.2) that $\eta \asymp d(z)$. Recall that the density of eigenvalues given in Theorem 2.11 is given by Ψ_1 , Ψ_2 and Θ which are expressed explicitly in Proposition 2.12 and Theorem 2.11. Since $\operatorname{Im} g(x_\pm) = \operatorname{Im} z$ and $\xi_\pm = \operatorname{Re} z - \operatorname{Re} g(x_\pm)$ (cf. Section 1), we conclude together with Proposition 6.2 that for $\beta_1 \leq \operatorname{Im} z \leq \alpha_1$

$$\Psi_1(z; h) = \frac{1}{2h} \partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} (x_-(z) - x_+(z)) + \mathcal{O}(d(z)^{-2}) = \frac{1}{2h} \partial_{\operatorname{Im} z}^2 S(z) + \mathcal{O}(d(z)^{-2}).$$

Next, it follows by (10.18) and Lemma 9.1 that

$$|2h\Psi_2 - (\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S)(-\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} \Theta)| = \mathcal{O} \left(d(z)^{3/4} h^{1/2} \frac{e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\delta^2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(d(z)^{3/4} h^{-3} \delta).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta d(z)^{-1/4} h^{-3/2})}{\pi} \{\Psi_1(z; h) + \Psi_2(z; h, \delta)\} e^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)} \\ (10.23) \quad &= \frac{1}{2\pi h} \partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} [(\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S(z)) e^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)}] + R(z; h, \delta) e^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R(z; h, \delta) := \mathcal{O} \left(d(z)^{-2} + d(z)^{3/4} h^{-1/2} \frac{e^{-\frac{2S}{h}}}{\delta^2} \right).$$

Let $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2 \leq \alpha_1$. Let us first treat the error term R . Similar as for (10.20), it follows that

$$R(z; h, \delta) = \mathcal{O} \left(d(z)^{-2} + d(z)^{-3/4} h^{-1/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h) d(z)^{1/2}}{Ch} \right\} \right).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} R(z; h, \delta) e^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)} d(\operatorname{Im} z) \right| &\leq \frac{[d(z)^{-1}]_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1}}{\mathcal{O}(1)} \exp\{-\Theta(\operatorname{Re} z, \alpha_1; h, \delta)\} \\
&\quad + \frac{d(z)^{1/4} h^{1/2}}{\mathcal{O}(1)} \exp \left[- \exp \left\{ - \frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h) d(z)^{1/2}}{Ch} \right\} \right] \Big|_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \\
&= \frac{\beta_1^{-1}}{\mathcal{O}(1)} \exp \left[- \exp \left\{ - \frac{(\alpha_1 - \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-^h) \alpha_1^{1/2}}{Ch} \right\} \right] \\
(10.24) \quad &= \frac{\varepsilon_0(h)^{-2/3}}{\mathcal{O}(1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2\pi h} \int_{\beta_2}^{\alpha_1} \partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} [(\partial_{\operatorname{Im} z} S(z)) e^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)}] L(\operatorname{Im} z) \\
(10.25) \quad = \frac{1}{2\pi h} (x_-(\operatorname{Im} z) - x_+(\operatorname{Im} z)) e^{-\Theta(z; h, \delta)} \Big|_{\beta_2}^{\alpha_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since,

$$\int_{\substack{\Sigma_{c,d} \\ 0 \leq \operatorname{Im} z \leq \alpha_1}} \frac{1}{2\pi h} p_*(d\xi \wedge dx)(dz) = \frac{1}{2\pi h} (x_-(\alpha_1) - x_+(\alpha_1)) \int_c^d d\operatorname{Re} z$$

we conclude by (10.21) the second statement of the proposition for

$$\beta_2 = \operatorname{Im} \gamma_-(\operatorname{Re} z) - \frac{h}{\varepsilon_0(h)^{1/3}} \ln \left(\beta \ln \frac{\varepsilon_0(h)^{1/3}}{h} \right)$$

with $\beta > 0$ large enough. The last statement of the proposition can be deduced similarly from (10.21), (10.25) and (10.24). $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Bordeaux-Montrieux, *Loi de Weyl presque sûre et résolvant pour des opérateurs différentiels non-autoadjoints*, *Thèse*, pastel.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/50/12/81/PDF/manuscrit.pdf (2008).
- [2] W. Bordeaux-Montrieux and J. Sjöstrand, *Almost sure Weyl asymptotics for non-self-adjoint elliptic operators on compact manifolds*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse **19** (2010), no. 3–4, 567–587.
- [3] T.J. Christiansen and M. Zworski, *Probabilistic Weyl Laws for Quantized Tori*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **299** (2010).
- [4] D.J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones, *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes*, vol. I-II, Springer, 2008.
- [5] E. B. Davies, *Pseudospectra of Differential Operators*, J. Oper. Th **43** (1997), 243–262.
- [6] ———, *Non-Self-Adjoint Operators and Pseudospectra*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math., vol. 76, Amer. Math. Soc., 2007.
- [7] E.B. Davies, *Pseudo-spectra, the harmonic oscillator and complex resonances*, Proc. of the Royal Soc. of London A **455** (1999), no. 1982, 585–599.
- [8] E.B. Davies and M. Hager, *Perturbations of Jordan matrices*, J. Approx. Theory **156** (2009), no. 1, 82–94.
- [9] N. Dencker, J. Sjöstrand, and M. Zworski, *Pseudospectra of semiclassical (pseudo-) differential operators*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **57** (2004), no. 3, 384–415.
- [10] M. Embree and L. N. Trefethen, *Spectra and Pseudospectra: The Behavior of Nonnormal Matrices and Operators*, Princeton University Press, 2005.

- [11] M. Hager, *Instabilité Spectrale Semiclassique d'Opérateurs Non-Autoadjoints II*, Annales Henri Poincaré **7** (2006), 1035–1064.
- [12] ———, *Instabilité spectrale semiclassique pour des opérateurs non-autoadjoints I: un modèle*, Annales de la faculté des sciences de Toulouse Sé. 6 **15** (2006), no. 2, 243–280.
- [13] M. Hager and J. Sjöstrand, *Eigenvalue asymptotics for randomly perturbed non-selfadjoint operators*, Mathematische Annalen **342** (2008), 177–243.
- [14] J.B. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, and B. Virág, *Zeros of Gaussian Analytic Functions and Determinantal Point Processes*, American Mathematical Society, 2009.
- [15] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, 2nd ed., Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1995.
- [16] B. Shiffman, *Convergence of random zeros on complex manifolds*, Science in China Series A: Mathematics **51** (2008), 707–720.
- [17] B. Shiffman and S. Zelditch, *Distribution of Zeros of Random and Quantum Chaotic Sections of Positive Line Bundles*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **200** (1999), 661–683.
- [18] ———, *Equilibrium distribution of zeros of random polynomials*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2003), 25–49.
- [19] ———, *Number Variance of Random Zeros on Complex Manifolds*, Geometric And Functional Analysis **18** (2008), 1422–1475.
- [20] J. Sjöstrand, *Eigenvalue distribution for non-self-adjoint operators with small multiplicative random perturbations*, Annales Fac. Sci. Toulouse **18** (2009), no. 4, 739–795.
- [21] ———, *Spectral properties of non-self-adjoint operators*, Actes des Journées d'é.d.p. d'Évian (2009).
- [22] ———, *Eigenvalue distribution for non-self-adjoint operators on compact manifolds with small multiplicative random perturbations*, Ann. Fac. Toulouse **19** (2010), no. 2, 277–301.
- [23] ———, *Resolvent Estimates for Non-Selfadjoint Operators via Semigroups*, Around the Research of Vladimir Maz'ya III, International Mathematical Series, no. 13, Springer, 2010, pp. 359–384.
- [24] ———, *Weyl law for semi-classical resonances with randomly perturbed potentials*, Mémoires de la SMF **136** (2014).
- [25] J. Sjöstrand and M. Zworski, *Elementary linear algebra for advanced spectral problems*, Annales de l'Institut Fourier **57** (2007), 2095–2141.
- [26] M. Sodin, *Zeros of Gaussian Analytic Functions and Determinantal Point Processes*, Mathematical Research Letters (2000), no. 7, 371–381.
- [27] L.N. Trefethen, *Pseudospectra of linear operators*, SIAM Rev. **39** (1997), no. 3, 383–406.

(Martin Vogel) INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE BOURGOGNE - UMR 5584 CNRS, UNIVERSITÉ DE BOURGOGNE, FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES MIRANDE, 9 AVENUE ALAIN SAVARY, BP 47870 21078 DIJON CEDEX.

E-mail address: martin.vogel@u-bourgogne.fr